

Kurt Abbas
January 4, 2010, 2:06 pm
3238 E. Macaw Ct.
Gilbert, Arizona 85297

In addition to what follows, when has a socialistic society prospered? The Soviet Union went broke under this premise, and China succeeds only by taking advantage of the many free markets that are out there. We have proof socialism doesn't prosper, and I do not want a socialistic internet, either.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Lauren Abbate
January 4, 2010, 2:15 pm
1613 Bauman Ave
ROYAL OAK, Michigan 48073

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Kenneth Abbott
January 4, 2010, 2:19 pm
1407 17th ave s
apt 204`
Birmingham, Alabama 35205

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

To put it bluntly, the Internet is the great thing it is precisely BECAUSE of the lack of government control. Don't screw it up.

Mike Abels
January 4, 2010, 2:20 pm
4932 N 85th St
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Why would the Government want to own the internet for the People? Leave well enough alone! Why would the Government want to own the internet? Taxation? Restriction and control? Anyone who wants access can get access, just pay for it themselves or go somewhere where there is public access.

HANDS OFF WHAT IS NOT YOURS!@#\$\$%^&*()_+}{":?><,./':[]=-\|

W> David Abernethy
January 4, 2010, 2:23 pm
8805 Hunters Way
Apple Valley, Minnesota 55124-9479

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I have yet to see a government operated business do well financially. Look at Medicare, Medicaid, TARP, Cash for Clunkers, Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and the Stimulus Programs. None of them have been funded properly, oversight is horrible and corruption is rampant.

John Abraham
January 4, 2010, 2:25 pm
1037 Beckford St.
New Castle, Pennsylvania 16101

Stay the hell out of the internet. You guys are trying to control everything that we say. I don't need the government to control everything in our daily lives. You guys can't even control your own lives.

LEAVE US ALONE!!

Steve Ackerman
January 4, 2010, 2:25 pm
12785 Pine Crest Dr.
Olive Branch, Mississippi 38654

We do not need nor want, and will oppose, even fight, any government intrusion into the area of internet control. There is no problem in this area, therefore no solution is needed. It is not broken, and any disguised attempt to impose government control will be viewed by millions of Americans like myself as an unjust violation of our inherent, constitutionally guaranteed freedoms.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Helen Adamietz
January 4, 2010, 2:26 pm
3128 E. 35th Ave.
Spokane, Washington 99223-4506

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I believe the internet is a major component in maintaining not just the free flow of information, but most importantly the FREE FLOW of FREEDOM.

Don't let the government screw it up like everything else they touch.

Christopher Adams
January 4, 2010, 2:27 pm
4601 Hilltop Pl NE
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87111

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

tracey Adams
January 4, 2010, 2:28 pm
5634 n 12th ave
phoenix, Arizona 85013

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

STAY OUT OF OUR BUSINESS!

Lois Adams-O'Boyle
January 4, 2010, 2:28 pm
8750 West National Avenue
West Allis, Wisconsin 53227

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dennis Aderholt
January 4, 2010, 2:29 pm
PO BOX 1041
Social Circle, Georgia 30025

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

THIS IS ALL ABOUT POWER AND CONTROLL, AND THE FACT THAT THE UN WANTS TO CONTROLL ALL OF US. THIS MUST BE STOPED IN ITS TRACKS NOW!!!!

Michele Adler
January 4, 2010, 2:31 pm
9108 Hidden Water Circle
Riverview, Florida 33578

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. The idea of letting the government get involved with the internet is frightening. A dictatorship could easily control it.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Raymond Agen
January 4, 2010, 2:35 pm
2151 Mousebird Ave. NW
Salem, Oregon 97304

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

NO MORE TAXES!!!NO MORE TAXES,,,when will Washinbgton get it!!!.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Joanna Ahearn
January 4, 2010, 2:36 pm
7431 Leyden Street
Commerce City, Colorado 80022

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Erwin Akins
January 4, 2010, 2:38 pm
PO Box 138
O'Brien, Oregon 97534

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

You have already taken or are trying to take away our rights to everything. This has got to stop, NOW!!!!

Phil Albert
January 4, 2010, 2:40 pm
7961 Owens Road
Minocqua, Wisconsin 54548

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive and needs to remain so. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Gerald Alborn
January 4, 2010, 2:40 pm
14 Mikell Drive
Dover, Delaware 19901

I submit the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Joan Alder
January 4, 2010, 2:41 pm
1203 Midvale Ct
Hampstead, Maryland 21074

More control?! In the land of the FREE? Stop this madness!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Michele Alder
January 4, 2010, 2:42 pm
1229 E 2200 N
North Logan, Utah 84341

As a citizen of the United States of America, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The proposed take over and federalization of the internet to make it equitable, is non-American. My ability to use the internet and the access to all that I now have access to will change. My options will become limited. Government intervention is not needed and has a history of crippling growth with all its regulations. Also there is no recourse for the people when the government infringes and misuses its regulatory powers but with a private company people can fire them or sue.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet CONTENT RESTRICTIONS, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. No different than telling us what to eat, what temperature to set our heaters at, it is no longer the land of the free.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Brenda E. Aldi
January 4, 2010, 2:43 pm
20 Meadow Pond Road
Hamburg, New Jersey 7419

I was alerted to this information at a TEA PARTY meeting this evening. As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Lisa Aldrich
January 4, 2010, 2:46 pm
445 Chippewa Circle
Sumter, South Carolina 29150

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

May I ask this question: What part of Free Press do you not understand?

S Aldrich
January 4, 2010, 2:46 pm
P.O. Box 538
Lincolnshire, Illinois 60069

I oppose FCC's proposed "take-over" of the internet and I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

carmeledia Alexander
January 4, 2010, 2:47 pm
9125 Rocky Point Road
Soddy Daisy, Tennessee 37379

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

sneaky-snakes

Lois Alexander
January 4, 2010, 2:49 pm
4043 Southamptton Drive
Jefferson City, Missouri 65109

The government, needs to stay out of our business and stop trying to take away our freedoms and access to services and taxing everything we eat, drink, use, or buy!. I think our internet sites need to be regulated to be made secure and a form of communication we can use freely and without fear of cyper hackers and getting our accounts broke into, things like that. American people need to have many forms of access and sites to choose how they wish to communicate, where it be by cell phone, landline phone, email, internet, twitter,facebook, whatever, We also need to have choice in what TV network we watch and should be able to get a well rounded view of everyone's perspectives, not JUST ONE SIDE, or one Political group.

We are watching Obama and his adimistration and their moves, since he lied about being open and transparent, and having the debate of health care on C span which he has not.

He is trying to sneak in too many things thru the back door and non announced or discussed or without given the public their option to vote for or against it.

Mr. & Mrs. Stephen Alexander
January 4, 2010, 2:51 pm
140 Sweetgum Dr.
Dover, Delaware 19904

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, We are submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

We are especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Lee and Carol Allee'
January 4, 2010, 2:51 pm
1291 Henry's Ln
Loma, Colorado 81524-8400

As an "Americans for Prosperity" activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We do not need more government intrusion!

Ted Allegrì
January 4, 2010, 2:52 pm
1045 Frink Rd
Moscow, Idaho 83843

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I would further add that the dangerous left wing agenda in all matters before us like Health Care, Cap and Tax, and now this, is going to bring a revolution down upon their heads like no other ever seen. Enough is enough, and we Americans are upset and ticked off. They had better stop their corrupt and manipulative ways and stop trying to ruin this beautiful country. Ted Allegrì

Scott Allen
January 4, 2010, 2:52 pm
459 Phyllis Dr.
Fruita, Colorado 81521

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank You
Scott Allen

Thomas Allen
January 4, 2010, 2:53 pm
6207 Haw Branch Court
Manassas, Virginia 20112

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

wendi allen
January 4, 2010, 2:55 pm
139 Hurt Dr
Smyrna, Georgia 30082

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The government has no business regulating or controlling the Internet. A free Internet belongs to The People and does not need government intrusion in any way, shape or form. We do not need government regulations or oversight for the Internet. We need freedom and free market economics to work their wonders.

JOHN ALONGE
January 4, 2010, 2:58 pm
1820 DOHERTY ROAD
COLORADO SPRINGS, Colorado 80916

As an american that loves FREEDOM I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Anthony Altano
January 4, 2010, 3:00 pm
1043 Rulnick St.
Apt. A
Fayetteville, North Carolina 28304-2464

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

WARNING!!!

REMEMBER THE TOTAL CLEANSING OF ALL CORRUPT POLITICIANS IN 2010!!!! We the People will speak softly with a BIG Vote to get rid of all the TRASH/CORRUPT Politicians!!! In God We Trust!!! Hoorah!!! READ THE BILL AND FOLLOW OUR CONSTITUTION!!!! OBAMA SHOW US YOUR REAL BIRTH CERTIFICATE ON 26 JANUARY 2010 IN FRONT OF THE COURTS!!! TAKE A BIG HINT AFTER THE NOVEMBER ELECTIONS!!! WE ARE ON THE MOVE AND ALL POLITICIANS THAT ARE WITH OBAMA AND VOTING AGAINST AMERICA WILL BE VOTED OUT OF OFFICE!!!

Sincerely a Concerned Vet and American Patriot,

Anthony Altano
January 4, 2010, 3:00 pm
1043 Rulnick St.
Apt. A
Fayetteville, North Carolina 28304-2464

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

WARNING!!!

REMEMBER THE TOTAL CLEANSING OF ALL CORRUPT POLITICIANS IN 2010!!!! We the People will speak softly with a BIG Vote to get rid of all the TRASH/CORRUPT Politicians!!! In God We Trust!!! Hoorah!!! READ THE BILL AND FOLLOW OUR CONSTITUTION!!!! OBAMA SHOW US YOUR REAL BIRTH CERTIFICATE ON 26 JANUARY 2010 IN FRONT OF THE COURTS!!! TAKE A BIG HINT AFTER THE NOVEMBER ELECTIONS!!! WE ARE ON THE MOVE AND ALL POLITICIANS THAT ARE WITH OBAMA AND VOTING AGAINST AMERICA WILL BE VOTED OUT OF OFFICE!!!

AMERICAN PATRIOTS WILL RISE AGAIN IF WE ARE FORCED!!! FOLLOW THE CONSTITUTION AND READ THE BILLS!!!!

AMERICANS TAKE CARE OF AMERICANS!!! HAVE SOME BALLS AND LETS TAKE BACK OUR COUNTRY!!!! WE ARE THE BEST COUNTRY IN THE WORLD!!!! WAKE UP YOU STUPID POLITICIANS AND GET RID OF THAT ILLEGAL ALIEN OBAMA!!!! IF YOU SHOVE THIS DOWN OUR THROATS THEN WE WILL STICK IT UP YOUR ASS IN 2010 ELECTIONS WHEN YOU TRY TO RUN AGAIN FOR OFFICE AND THIS IS A FACT YOU TRAITOR!!! IT IS ALSO ILLEGAL TO BE PAID TO VOTE FOR THIS AND YOU ARE WORKING FOR THE PEOPLE NOT THE DEMOCRATS!!!

Sincerely a Concerned Vet and American Patriot,

Georgia Alvis-Long
January 4, 2010, 3:02 pm
140 New Hope and Crimora Rd.
Waynesboro, Virginia 22980-6403

The government has grown far too large and has way too many regulations as it is. It is time for the government to realize that the people of this great nation are "fed up with the fed". We do not want this to go forward. Private investment and Capitalism must be the highest priority for this Country to survive. TAKE THIS AS A FIRM "NO" TO YOUR PROPOSAL!!!!!!

Leona Joy Ambuehl
January 4, 2010, 3:02 pm
20601 Lemarsh Street
Chatsworth, California 91311

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Basically - STAY OUT OF MY LIFE, GOVERNMENT!

Roberta Amley
January 4, 2010, 3:02 pm
200 26th Ave N
St. Petersburg, Florida 33704

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Fred Amsler
January 4, 2010, 3:04 pm
1738 East 3rd Street
#316
Williamsport, Pennsylvania 17701

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The internet has become an essential tool for personal and business use. Keep it free and open for all to use and enjoy.

Jack Anastasi
January 4, 2010, 3:05 pm
8521 Windsong Valley Dr
Wake Forest, North Carolina 27587

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Let free enterprise rule. I do not support any more government intrusion into our lives. The government has a proven track record of inefficiency, waste, and fraud. Why would anyone want to give the government more power is a mystery to me. The internet needs to remain strong. The only way to do that it to let the innovation, and private enterprise competition continue to create a better, faster, cheaper internet.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

jason andersen
January 4, 2010, 3:05 pm
nma.
powdersprings, Georgia 30127

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Beverly anderson
January 4, 2010, 3:06 pm
1618 Dunmore Way
Sarasota,, Florida 34231

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

We do not want to loose our freedom that our forefathers fought and gave their lives for and the internet run by government regulation would be disastrous.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Charleen Anderson
January 4, 2010, 3:09 pm
1109 W C Ave
La Center, Washington 98629

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Debra Anderson
January 4, 2010, 3:09 pm
6876 E. San Cristobal way
Gold Canyon, Arizona 85118

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

John Anderson
January 4, 2010, 3:09 pm
Box 954
Fraser, Colorado 80442

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

FIRST: Let the free market work and keep the government out of controlling the internet except for national security issues ...
REAL ISSUES

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Leonard Anderson
January 4, 2010, 3:10 pm
801 10th Street NE
East Wenatchee, Washington 98802

As an American, and as long as I am still 'free' to do so, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Maureen Anderson
January 4, 2010, 3:10 pm
205 Copper Hill Drive
Cary, North Carolina 27518

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Michael Anderson
January 4, 2010, 3:10 pm
29002 Acanthus Court
Agoura Hills, California 91301

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Leave us alone.

Stephen Anderson
January 4, 2010, 3:12 pm
7907 E 162nd Pl
Belton, Missouri 64012

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The Internet is a free system that works and will continue to work unless some government entity begins to interfere with private enterprise. Why fix something this is not broken with some sort of governmental oversight that is not needed. The purpose of government is to provide services for the taxpayers that they cannot readily supply for themselves. This has been working for some time with governmental interference and there is no need for government to step in and interfere.

Connie Andres
January 4, 2010, 3:12 pm
PO 1296
PC, Utah 84060

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Regards

Jody Andrews
January 4, 2010, 3:13 pm
25415 Cortez Blvd
Brooksville, Florida 34601

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,
Jody Andrews

Francesco Angelini
January 4, 2010, 3:13 pm
1942 Grange Avenue
Racine, Wisconsin 53403

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Debra Anthony
January 4, 2010, 3:14 pm
7950 Franklin Road
Evans City, Pennsylvania 16033

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I find it very disturbing that government control of the internet is under consideration by the FCC. The language that is being used to frame this ruling, such as "net neutrality" and "open internet" is very deceiving. Matters of this importance should rightfully be debated by our elected members of Congress, not decided by federal regulators. This matter certainly has not been adequately publicized to give Americans the opportunity to respond to this back-door entrance of yet more government control. This is an outrage. I am strongly opposed.

Kim Antoniou
January 4, 2010, 3:15 pm
10448 W. Coggins, Suite C
Sun City, Arizona 85351

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sandra Apanasewicz
January 4, 2010, 3:19 pm
7480 N Meadowpark Dr
Walton Hills, Ohio 44146

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Terri Arbucci
January 4, 2010, 3:21 pm
2999 Smith Springs Rd - Apt J175
Nashville, Tennessee 37217

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD STOP TRYING TO TAKE CONTROL OVER, OR INTERFERE WITH FREE ENTERPRISE!

JoAnn Argentino
January 4, 2010, 3:22 pm
201 Teapot Court
Reisterstown, Maryland 21136

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Do not take any more of our rights away from us!

Zdena Aris
January 4, 2010, 3:22 pm
3929 Leaffield Dr
Austin, Texas 78749

As an American, I am submitting my support regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet.

K. Arling
January 4, 2010, 3:24 pm
2469 Franciscan Dr.
Clearwater, Florida 33763

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Susan Arnberg
January 4, 2010, 3:25 pm
1040 N. Lake Shore Dr.
Chicago, Illinois 60611

As an freedom-loving American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Charles D arnett
January 4, 2010, 3:26 pm
210 bent Oak Circle
HARVEST, Alabama 35749

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Therefore leave our internet system alone.

Jeanine arrigo
January 4, 2010, 3:27 pm
3499 westbury rd
kettering, Ohio 45409

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

Kaye Arwood
January 4, 2010, 3:27 pm
3411 Garth Road
Baytown, Texas 77521

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

This is a Government Control Action. This is a way of stopping Religious and personal Freedom that this country has enjoyed since its beginning. This is communism. Past history tells us this is very dangerous.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Linda Ashburn
January 4, 2010, 3:28 pm
2065 N Luett Ave
Indianapolis, Indiana 46222

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Stay the heck out of it. This is not China. You have no right in controlling what or who is on the internet.

Ed Auger
January 4, 2010, 3:28 pm
3008 Dartmouth Drive
Plano, Texas 75075

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a bad, bad idea. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale at all for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Keep your hands off of our "free market" businesses. The Federal government has no business in business.

Jeannie Aviles
January 4, 2010, 3:32 pm
104 Deerglade Court
Lexington, South Carolina 29072

Enough!!! government control. I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

D Babb
January 4, 2010, 3:32 pm
11 Windsor Mews
Cherry Hill, New Jersey 8002

As an American Patriot, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN
Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

It is against the very principles of our founding fathers and the rights guaranteed us all under the US Constitution.
This must not be allowed to happen in the United States.

Albert Baciocco
January 4, 2010, 3:33 pm
747 Pitt Street
Mt. Pleasant, South Carolina 29464

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be openly debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Gerald & Charlene Backus
January 4, 2010, 3:34 pm
1073 S. Archers Way
Nekoosa, Wisconsin 54457-8016

We are submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Philip & Donna Badger
January 4, 2010, 3:35 pm
17411 Ficus Ct
Spring, Texas 77388

As an Americans for Prosperity , I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Darlene Baggett
January 4, 2010, 3:35 pm
1743 South Ave.
Springfield, Missouri 65807

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.
Stay out of our affairs!!!

Patricia Bahl
January 4, 2010, 3:35 pm
7615 N Kansas Ave
Gladstone, Missouri 64119

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Carolyn Bailey Family & Friends
January 4, 2010, 3:36 pm
5095 Debbie Ln
Redding, California 96002

As an Americans for Prosperity activists, We are submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

We are especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Russell Bailiff
January 4, 2010, 3:36 pm
25394 Fackler Road
Sunman, Indiana 47041

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Russell E. Bailiff

Vicky Bair
January 4, 2010, 3:37 pm
110 Blue Cedar
Bull Shoals, Arkansas 72619

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” and even “Satellite” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

I think that such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I fear that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Martha Bajema
January 4, 2010, 3:38 pm
1300 E. Axton Rd.
Bellingham, Washington 98226

I am utterly against this so-called "Open Internet" which the present Administration is planning to impose.

The Internet should be kept private; it should not be run/ruled/regulated by the Federal Govn't. (and it sucks that taxpayers are at the mercy of ruling "elites."

Raymond & Rosemarie Bajer
January 4, 2010, 3:39 pm
1090 Half Hitch Road
Prescott Valley, Arizona 86314

As American citizens and Americans for Prosperity activists, We are submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

We are especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Barbara Baker
January 4, 2010, 3:40 pm
10 Dawn Hill Drive
Sandy, Utah 84092

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

This subject is more than "opinion" as to who manages the internet, as it is at the core of free speech, and the government should stay out. Government interference is already extremely visible in the control of the airwaves. The government's job is to keep them free, not to restrict them. People and markets would control them if government stopped interfering. Take the freedom to buy our own cars--this has made the whole industry, from production to possession a highly prosperous and pleasant freedom. Government interference by telling us how, what, and when we can produce or possess is negative.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unconstitutionally restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. This tells me that I am under a regime, one that is not Constitutional nor is friendly to individual freedom.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please stop this takeover of individual freedom!

Barbara Baker
January 4, 2010, 3:40 pm
10 Dawn Hill Drive
Sandy, Utah 84092

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is an exciting example of free market success. Government takeovers of free market create blackmarkets, smuggling, and stagnation of competition, creativity, ingenuity, and inventiveness.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jennifer Baker
January 4, 2010, 3:40 pm
4402 Bridgeport
Wilmington, North Carolina 28405

As a concerned American who supports and believes in our constitution, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We are still a democracy and I expect elected officials to act accordingly.

Mel Baker
January 4, 2010, 3:41 pm
1324 W. Wisconsin Ave. #305
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

America is unique to the rest of the world for the freedoms we enjoy. This legislation does not advance the cause of freedom but instead would put us in the league of lesser nations.

Wylie Baker
January 4, 2010, 3:42 pm
3650 Forestbrooj Rd #109
Myrtle Beach,, South Carolina 29588

RE: GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Simply put, you folks can not even run and enforce a simple legal ruling by a Federal Judge in Illinois against a gentleman by name of "Kevin Trudeau." Time Warner Cable is STILL RUNNING all his INFOMERCIALS on Cable!!!!

Trust you folks with internet? "Kevin Trudeau has bilked 100's of thousands of old folks out of money. Ordered to pay \$5 million bucks in restitution. Held in contempt of court many times. Banned in Conneticut. Banned in Missouri, Banned in Illinois and you folks want to run the INTERNET???? You simple jerks do not have the brains to run a tricycle much less the INTERNET!!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Rita Bakos
January 4, 2010, 3:43 pm
PO Box 2006
Ridgway, Colorado 814732

Regarding GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Leave the internet as it is. No government regulation, supervision, oversight or taxes or anything else. It functions just fine now.

Michele Baldwin
January 4, 2010, 3:43 pm
11703 Huebner Rd. 106263
San Antonio, Texas 78230

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Michele Baldwin

Rodney Balke
January 4, 2010, 3:43 pm
4302 Pembroke Parkway West
Colleyville, Texas 76034

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Furthermore, I strongly object to this Administration's grab of control in every facet of our lives. I do not want America to become a Socialist state.

Marice Ballesteros
January 4, 2010, 3:44 pm
13300 Locust ST
Kansas City, Missouri 64145

I could just scream, stick my head out the window and say "I'm not going to take it anymore".
As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

All I can say is that this last year has us citizens who believe in property rights and personal freedom about to bust a gut. What next..... tell me what health care I can have??? Oh yeah, that's coming too.

Mitchell Bank
January 4, 2010, 3:44 pm
PO Box 5904
Hauppauge, New York 11788

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

As a sovereign citizen, I am 110% against this course being taken.

Timothy Banks
January 4, 2010, 3:46 pm
27848 Red Arrow Hwy
Mattawan, Michigan 49071

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I personally oppose most attempts at government to regulate. Regulation precedes takeover and there is nothing the fascists in our government would love more than control of the content of the internet.

Adrian Banky
January 4, 2010, 3:46 pm
6 Jonathan Smith Road
Morristown, New Jersey 7960

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I could give you a lot of words, but I won't. The internet is a terrific modern tool that works best in an open and free environment. It is not broken. It does not need government to break it.

Leave it alone. Freedom is a good thing.

Michael Bantum
January 4, 2010, 3:47 pm
1153 Curtiss Ave
San Jose, California 95125

FCC:

As a senior software engineer, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

KEEP YOUR HANDS OFF OUR INTERNET.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Nancy Banz
January 4, 2010, 3:47 pm
106 North 7th Street
Wyoming, Illinois 61491

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I will be watching closely to see how representatives vote, and my next vote will be in direct response to how they treat my freedom.

Jim Barbour
January 4, 2010, 3:49 pm
5844 Berkshire Ct.
Alexandria, Virginia 22303

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

It is an outrage to even think that such a "power grab" is actually being considered, and I for one am adamantly opposed to it. So opposed, in fact, that I am prepared to work tirelessly for votes against the Democratic incumbents in Congress and the White House who treat us with such disdain. And this comes from one (me) who has voted mostly Democratic throughout my entire life. No more, though. I, my wife, her mother and my parents no longer recognize a once great party that truly cared for its constituency, but which now pursues some un-American brazen agenda designed to turn this nation into another socialist state.

Michael Barile
January 4, 2010, 3:51 pm
963 Lakeside Dr.
Rahway, New Jersey 7065

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Leave the internet use alone, or citizens will use it to defeat those who support this abridgement of our rights and freedoms. Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Linda Barkes
January 4, 2010, 3:51 pm
P.O. Box 589
Seligman, Arizona 86337

The government needs to stay away from the internet. The internet needs to remain free from government.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

curtis barnes
January 4, 2010, 3:51 pm
20 soundway
soundbeach, New York 11789

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Keep your filthy perverted socialist commie hand off your nose out of the internet. Drop dead!!

Joey Barnes
January 4, 2010, 3:53 pm
839 180th St
Powhattan, Kansas 66527

As an American for FREEDOM, PROSPERITY and the PURSUIT OF HAPINESS, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is the last bastion of freedom in the United States. It is the only social, economic tool at our disposal free from endless regulatory requirements and prying eyes of bureaucrats who success is measured by the level of pain, grief and monetary discomfort inflicted upon private entrepreneurs.

The internet also allows Americans to showcase their God given talents without bias or discrimination. You do not know whether the user is black, white, male, female, handicapped, gay, straight, transsexual or sitting naked in front of the computer screen.

The internet is also highly competitive. If you don't believe me, just ask AOL. There is no need to "regulate" on the guise of competition or consumer protection.

The Internet is free from government subsidy and control that inevitably gives way to the political winds and whims that favor one social/economic classification over another. Indeed, if the "public utility" model is the desired outcome of the internet, then I can only conclude that the proponents of regulation harbor seditious desires to control the freedom, wealth, and even the vary thoughts of the American public.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that at the least, should be debated in Congress by legitimately elected legislatures. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing the alarm bell for so long (since 2002) that the meer lack of their predictions coming to fruition should tell us that their claims are unfounded.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations to control this great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the Internet has become.

Cynthia Barnett
January 4, 2010, 3:53 pm
5401 Park Place
Flower Mound, Texas 75028

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

The Constitution has allowed free Americans to have freedom on speech and expression and now the government wants to get involved with the internet and that is wrong? Lawmakers, not the White House should be making decisions according to the voices of free Americans.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

JANET BARNETTE
January 4, 2010, 3:53 pm
4703 COUNTRY CLUB BLVD.
SOUTH CHARLESTON, West Virginia 25309

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

NANCY J BARR
January 4, 2010, 3:53 pm
254 WINTER HAVEN DR
CAMDEN, Delaware 19934

As an American citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sheldon Barr
January 4, 2010, 3:53 pm
12506 Fern Vale Ct
Houston, Texas 77065-5014

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Respectfully,

Catherine Barrett
January 4, 2010, 3:55 pm
7186 Dateland St
Englewood, Florida 34224

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James Alvan Barrus
January 4, 2010, 3:55 pm
29 Pioneer Way
Springfield, Massachusetts 1119

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Robert Bartlett
January 4, 2010, 3:55 pm
1234 Sagecountry
Houston, Texas 77089

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Robert Barton
January 4, 2010, 3:55 pm
PO Box 175
Kingston, Arkansas 72742

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

There is no credible argument for taking what has been built, funded, and maintained freely and efficiently by the marketplace and turning it over to heavy-handed, inefficient, politically motivated government regulation. This will be rightly seen as another intrusion by big government (you) into the lives of ordinary citizens. There is no public outcry for this move, and rightly so. Government intervention into the free market is contrary to the best interests of the citizens of the United States.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Gary Baskin
January 4, 2010, 3:55 pm
605 Lynn Shores Dr.
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23452

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Gary Bass
January 4, 2010, 3:55 pm
2948 warren chapel rd
Decherd, Tennessee 37324

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Gary Bass

catherine batcheller
January 4, 2010, 3:56 pm
90 cod ln
chatham, Massachusetts 2633

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Is there nothing that you will not try to control and regulate and in the end, destroy? There is nothing wrong with the internet as it functions now. Look at what it has become for goodness sake! What a gift to the world!! Leave freedom of speech and communication alone and leave Americans alone. We can think for ourselves believe it or not. Besides, is our economy not damaged enough as it is? You want to risk the loss of more successful private businesses? But that's your agenda isn't it? Soon there will be no private sector if you can have your strident, dictatorial and arrogant way. The will and well being of the people be damned.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James Bateman
January 4, 2010, 3:56 pm
1102 Wildwood Way
Tool, Texas 75143

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In short it my firm belief that the Federal government has absolutely no good reason to, in effect, confiscate a private business enterprise. To proceed with the subject plan to ipso facto remake the internet into a "public utility" is a very suspect and dishonest, unconstitutional, socialistic and unAmerican misuse of federal authority. This nation is great because of our system of free enterprise. Government interference depresses that system and is totally inept in every attempt ever made to get any job done which business can do better.

The American people are sick and tired of these ill-advised attempts at increasing control of our lives. When our Freedom and Liberty are at stake we shall not accept such brazened attempts to limit what government cannot give us: our Freedom and Liberty.

Fredy Bates
January 4, 2010, 3:56 pm
5617 Cheetah Chase
Littleton, Colorado 80124

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Regulate China. Regulate Japan. Regulate Korea. Stop killing commerce in the US. American industry and commerce has had more than enough of your "help".

Lisa Bates
January 4, 2010, 3:57 pm
4924 West Wrightwood Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60639

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Hands off of my Internet!

Jerod Batte
January 4, 2010, 3:58 pm
4775 Oakwood Drive, Apt. #924
Odessa, Texas 79761

As an Americans for Prosperity activist and a citizen deeply interested in electronic media and matters of free speech, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is - and should remain - highly competitive. Traditional telephone and cable companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. This capitalist system serves as a rudimentary check against marketplace corruption in Internet Service Providers (ISP). If a private company such as one of the aforementioned ISPs blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would eventually lose all its customers, who would flock to another ISP. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place for weary consumers to turn for relief.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create dramatic litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring even more government control and politicization along with government ownership. Such politicization would definitely pose a risk to online freedom of speech in the near future as a result of this "public utility model". Regardless, such a "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be heavily debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not take it upon itself to set such dramatic and potentially devastating regulatory changes into motion that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. These restrictions pose the greatest threat to our First Amendment rights online.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years - beginning with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the self-proclaimed "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators" - that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and free expression that the lightly regulated, highly competitive Internet has become. To impose such regulations would be to destroy the Internet as we know it and transform it into another government-sanctioned, heavily taxed (and therefore higher priced) machine where the consumers are oppressed and freedom of speech is no longer tolerated.

Please, do whatever is necessary to keep government hands off of the Internet! The survival of the growing online culture depends upon a free, open and competitive Internet market.

Lawrence Bau
January 4, 2010, 3:59 pm
5150 Avenida Despacio
Laguna Woods, California 92637

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Steve Baumann
January 4, 2010, 4:00 pm
639 Pekin Ave
East Peoria, Illinois 61611

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be an option. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Government control of the internet would most likely inhibit free speech and knowledge which in my opinion is the main reason for wanting shange.

marcia Baumgartner
January 4, 2010, 4:03 pm
1703 E Prairie Ave
1703 E Prairie Ave
Wheaton, Illinois 60187

Please, no government interference in the Internet as proposed in your "open internet" program. NO NO NO!

Gail Baxter
January 4, 2010, 4:03 pm
11300 Glenwood
Overland Park, Kansas 66211

As Concerned Citizen of the United States, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

John Beane
January 4, 2010, 4:04 pm
7028 White Bridge Lane
Leland, North Carolina 28451

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank you,

John Beane

Robert Beaton
January 4, 2010, 4:05 pm
7906 Flower Av., #1
Takoma Park, Maryland 20912

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Michael Beauchane
January 4, 2010, 4:05 pm
2758 Old Highway 431 South
Springfield, Tennessee 37172

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I want to make this plain and clear to those of you in D.C. , screw with my services that I pay for and I'll make it a point to come and pay each one of you a visit to express my outrage and anger , you will be held accountable!!

Anita Becker
January 4, 2010, 4:06 pm
5179 Miller Paul Rd.
Westerville, Ohio 43082

I am AGAINST government running of the internet.

Please do not take any steps in that direction!

Perry Bee
January 4, 2010, 4:07 pm
3181 NE 23rd St.
A202
Gresham, Oregon 97030

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This is a serious matter in which the American people need to decide and have. Our rights are not something that should be questioned.

Sincerely,
Perry Bee

Thomas Beebe
January 4, 2010, 4:08 pm
69 Roosevelt Road
Carbondale, Illinois 62901

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

As an Amateur Radio operator I have watched the erosion of the "Ham" bands and the licensing requirements over the past 10 years. If this is any example of what you, the FCC, will do with the Internet, I have to say I am strongly against any change.

Winifred begley
January 4, 2010, 4:10 pm
20121 Bill Collins road
Eustis, Florida 32736

Keep the government out of controlling the internet.

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sam Behunin
January 4, 2010, 4:12 pm
280 SW Delta Drive
Beaverton, Oregon 97006

What you are talking about is neither an open internet or net neutrality. What we have now is an open and neutral internet. The Federal government and the FCC have vitually no place in regulating the internet. Almost any regulation would be contrary the my rights of free speech and freedom of press.

Douglas Beilharz
January 4, 2010, 4:13 pm
10593 Hickory Knoll Dr.
Brighton, Michigan 48114-9297

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Robert Beken
January 4, 2010, 4:13 pm
411 Sycamore Drive
Lincoln, Nebraska 68510

As a computer security professional, and EFF supporter, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Rosemarie Belan
January 4, 2010, 4:13 pm
283 Three Bridge Road
Monroeville, New Jersey 8343

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I am really getting tired of the way this country is being steered!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Roy Bell
January 4, 2010, 4:14 pm
1116 Tulane Dr
Arlington, Texas 76012

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

Liken it if you will, to the freedom the Native Americans enjoyed before the U. S. Government took those freedoms away as well as the lands which they had grown up on.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Joseph Bell
January 4, 2010, 4:14 pm
PO Box 2306
Boone, North Carolina 28607

Regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet: GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

LaVonne Bennett
January 4, 2010, 4:15 pm
637 Bennett Road
Ionia, Michigan 48846

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Leave our Constitutionally-protected "Freedom of Speech" alone!

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Leave our Constitutionally-guaranteed "Freedom of Speech" alone!

LaVonne Bennett
January 4, 2010, 4:15 pm
637 Bennett Road
Ionia, Michigan 48846

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

June Benoit
January 4, 2010, 4:16 pm
5524 64th Ave NW
Gig Harbor, Washington 98335

MY COMMENT IS - THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD BACK OFF FROM TRYING TO TAKE OVER EVERY ASPECT OF OUR LIVES.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Alexis Bercq
January 4, 2010, 4:16 pm
54 Las Tusas Road
Ranchos de Taos, New Mexico 87557

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank you for your attention about this issue.

Thomas T Berge
January 4, 2010, 4:16 pm
659 High Plains Courtr
Grand Forks, North Dakota 58201

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

If you have any qu4estions related to me , Please CONTACT ME.

Thank you
Thomas T Berge

Lynn Bergman
January 4, 2010, 4:18 pm
225 Riverside Park Road
Bismarck, North Dakota 58504

I am submitting this comment regarding GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. There is no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Find something more productive to do with your time, like sticking your thumb up your ass like other government employees, and leave private enterprise alone!

Vicki Bermudez
January 4, 2010, 4:18 pm
11329 Southtowne Court
South Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53172

I am sure that I will not be the first to raise the concern that governmental regulation on any level restricts the most basic of our American rights—freedom of choice.

With any free nation comes individual responsibility. While it is true that some individuals will make bad choices, and others will make good ones, it is also true that all actions have consequences, and all who make choices will either suffer the results of bad choices, or be rewarded for good ones. Let's not forget that we all have the capacity to learn, and those who make bad choices will learn from their mistakes. Some of the most caring people, some of the most well-rounded people, some of the most ambitious people in the world had to learn from their bad choices. Please, let individuals make their choice in regards to what they see, hear, and do, with respect to the Internet. Do not impose the morals of one person or group of persons by regulating in any way, shape or form, what by rights is an individual issue.

Sandra Bernhard
January 4, 2010, 4:18 pm
532 Menominee
Naperville, Illinois 60563

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sergio J. Bernier-Ramos
January 4, 2010, 4:20 pm
9414 Moonlit Glade Rd.
Helotes, Texas 78023-4411

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

George Berry
January 4, 2010, 4:21 pm
41 Redwine Overlook
Newnan, Georgia 30263

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

And lastly let me add that in the past 10-15 years the internet has brought untold benefits to Americans and people in many other countries. It allows us to communicate ideas, buy and sell products and enjoy music and video. If we do not like what our providers offer with price or features we can drop them and find another provider. The internet is already "open" and the heavy hand of government will not make it more so, only less.

George Berry
1/8/10

Mark Best
January 4, 2010, 4:23 pm
21339 Black Forest Ct.
Flat Rock, Michigan 48134

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,

Mark F. Best

Jane Betteridge
January 4, 2010, 4:23 pm
1205 Oakland Drive
Anderson, Indiana 46012

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Furthermore, I am incensed with the deceptive language used in the naming of bigger-government, freedom-limiting legislation such as these offensive proposed “Open Internet” rules. The internet is already open. It is obvious that the rules are meant to restrict it.

Bill Betts
January 4, 2010, 4:24 pm
2510 Howard Drive
Redding, California 96001-3708

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dwight Beuthling
January 4, 2010, 4:24 pm
872 Uhen Ct
Burlington, Wisconsin 53105

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

It's time that all the liberal in Washington start to do the peoples will and representing the people. Enacting a law like this is an infringement on my right of FREEDOM OF SPEECH given to me by the Constitution. I think our so called representative should have to pass a test on the Constitution and our Bill of Rights

Connie Bevan
January 4, 2010, 4:24 pm
168 West 500 North
Springville, Utah 84663-1090

As a Conservative/Independent activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

David Beverly
January 4, 2010, 4:26 pm
800 East C Street
Iron Mountain, Michigan 49801

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

As always, government intervention into the private sector is a very bad idea. This is nothing more than a power grab. The government has no need, and quite possibly no authority, to interfere with the workings of the market place.

Mr. & Mrs. Leonard J. Bibbo
January 4, 2010, 4:26 pm
19 Barony Lane
Hilton Head Island, South Carolina 29928

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

We are especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

M. Bice
January 4, 2010, 4:27 pm
PO Box 1127
Taylors, South Carolina 29687

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Adrian Bickley
January 4, 2010, 4:27 pm
10906 Oak Harbor Drive
Louisville, Kentucky 40299

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I share my concern also as an internet businessman. This would stifle business nationally and internationally.

Terry Biehl
January 4, 2010, 4:27 pm
8853 Emahiser Rd
Caledonia, Ohio 43314

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This country is becoming more & more communist every day. Do not do this to America & we the people who can choose to vote you out of office.

Bill Bill
January 4, 2010, 4:27 pm
4924 balboa Blvd.
Encino, California 91335

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

PLEASE go ahead with your plans for open Internet for everyone equally.

Stop big business from controlling speeds.

Russell C. Bingley
January 4, 2010, 4:28 pm
34 Gerber Ln.
Cody, Wyoming 82414

Leave you hands off the internet. Every thing that Uncle Frankenstein touches becomes worse.

Nancy Bintz
January 4, 2010, 4:29 pm
5700 Highland Way #201
Middleton, Wisconsin 53562

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please stop government interference in our daily lives. We've already lost too many freedoms.

Martha Bisaccio
January 4, 2010, 4:29 pm
16 Evans Road
16 Evans Road
Riverdale, New Jersey 7457

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

A transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Leave our internet alone ! We need to retain this avenue of unfettered public free speech, especially in this age of monopolistic networks controlling much of the print media and TV stations.

Mr & Mrs Bischof
January 4, 2010, 4:29 pm
34 S. Ridge Ave
Arl. Hts., Illinois 60005

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In conclusion... You cannot get more "Open Internet" than keeping the Government out of it!... The Internet is already OPEN and being run by the Free Enterprise Market Place... It cannot get much freer than that...

Keep in mind every time Government has gotten involved we end up losing our Freedoms and what was once "FREE" now ends up costing Americans an arm and a leg.

Please do not be fooled again by these people... Keep America Free. Keep Government from destroying Free Enterprise... Let the Market Place be self regulating... That is what America is all about...

Alan Bishop
January 4, 2010, 4:29 pm
1601 Slate Run Rd.
New Albany, Indiana 47150

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We don't need government sensorship of the last place where you can get the facts and not just what they want us to know.

Candi Bishop
January 4, 2010, 4:29 pm
4931 E. State Farm Rd.
North Platte, Nebraska 69101

Keep the government OUT of the Internet business! This is outrageous power-grabbing and totally un-American. (Not that you guys care about the Constitution)

Nicole Bishop
January 4, 2010, 4:30 pm
2307 NE 33rd St.
Cape Coral, Florida 33909

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Diane Bittle
January 4, 2010, 4:31 pm
14342 Cochran Rd.
Marion, Illinois 62959

I am fed up with the government wanting to control every aspect of my life...from paying taxes, to health care and now to controlling the internet that is used for news and communicating. It needs to STOP!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Melody Black
January 4, 2010, 4:31 pm
5754 Jericho Rd
Pt Pleasant, West Virginia 25550

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I am entirely against any additional regulation of the internet and its users by the government.

Victoria Black
January 4, 2010, 4:31 pm
932 Tilmanstone Rd.
Millen, Georgia 30442

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. I am against the FCC's proposal of "Open Internet" rule and in support of a truly open, competitive, privately owned and controlled network,

douglas blackman
January 4, 2010, 4:35 pm
8 halter ct
mt laurel, New Jersey 8054

I am not interested in the government controlling the internet - let free enterprise and innovation continue. Although there likely will be issues, this is better than government control.

This comment is submitted regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Millard Blanchard
January 4, 2010, 4:35 pm
897 Wilmar Cir
Blairsville, Georgia 30512

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The most recent mandate by the federal government that over the air television switch to high definition cost many less affluent folks their TV reception since the switch to HD cut the power and put many people who could not afford cable or satellite out of reach of over the air TV. Don't let the feds get involved with the internet, they'll screw it up, as well.

Mary Kay Blasiar-Jones
January 4, 2010, 4:36 pm
PO Box 793
Blue Jay, California 92317

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Leave our internet alone, the free market will take care of any problems!

Bob Blettenberg
January 4, 2010, 4:37 pm
58 Carter Rd
Sagle, Idaho 83860

As an American Citizen, You are going too far in your grab for power over every aspect. Keep your hands off the Internet. I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Alan Blitzblau
January 4, 2010, 4:37 pm
104 Mill View Circle
Williamsburg, Virginia 23185

As a concerned American citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

John Blue
January 4, 2010, 4:38 pm
540 N Carpenter Road
Titusville, Florida 32796

Like so many of my fellow Americans-for-Prosperty colleagues, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised (i.e., monopolized) control over the Internet, there would be no other place to turn for free/unfettered access to the Internet.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in the sunshine in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. It would be illegal and unconstitutional for the Commission to set into motion its own regulatory changes to force this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Joseph Bodenstedt
January 4, 2010, 4:38 pm
22 W. Uhler Ave.
Alexandria, Virginia 22301

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

A word of advice to the government: Keep your hands off the Internet!

CRAIG BOHLEN
January 4, 2010, 4:39 pm
620 COTTONFIELD CIRCLE
WAXHAW, North Carolina 28173

As an Americans for Prosperity friend, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Barbara Bohovic
January 4, 2010, 4:39 pm
7444 W. Firelands
Hudson, Ohio 44236

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Carolyn Bolger
January 4, 2010, 4:39 pm
415 N. Woodcroft Ln.
Schaumburg, Illinois 60173

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Heavy-handed regulation could destroy private investment in the Internet, in turn forcing taxpayers to spend hundreds of billions of dollars to keep the Internet functioning, bringing government ownership and control.

Colleen Boling
January 4, 2010, 4:39 pm
1948 Kimberly Rd
Mosinee, Wisconsin 54455

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Since 1998 I have been actively using the internet and seen how competition has driven the market to provide better and faster service. I have seen regions with few options grow to several options. My mother has a farm and I was comparing companies top provide high speed service for her and had 5 options to choose from within seconds of searching. Government control of the internet providers will slow and over time destroy growth with bureaucracy.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

George Bookout
January 4, 2010, 4:40 pm
801 Hairston
Altus, Oklahoma 73521

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. You are a bunch of IDIOTS.

James Booth
January 4, 2010, 4:40 pm
P. O. Box 82
Brady, Nebraska 69123

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In summation, I strongly oppose any additional regulation or government control of the internet. The existing regulations are sufficient. Any thing beyond the existing regulations would be an outright infringement on our constitutionally guaranteed freedom of speech.

Jerome C. Borden
January 4, 2010, 4:41 pm
1571 E. Beechwood Drive
Layton, Utah 84040-2226

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. There are at least four wireless providers in my area plus numerous WiFi "hot spots". If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

REgina S. Bossle
January 4, 2010, 4:41 pm
3809 Amy Pl.
Loveland, Colorado 80538

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Lastly, the govt controls too much already. Give us our freedoms back.

Bonnie Bost
January 4, 2010, 4:42 pm
1194 Riverview Dr. Unit#5614
Ellijay, Georgia 30540

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

It would be difficult for me to run my business, teaching music to children and helping them learn and increase their test scores, if any thing on the internet was censored!! Please leave the internet a FREE area to speak!!

Carter Boswell
January 4, 2010, 4:43 pm
HC 15870 Box 4
Sahuarita, Arizona 85629

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Come on FCC, leave the internet alone and let it grow. Like all big buracracies the FCC just has to get bigger, more powerful, at the detriment of all it serves.

Gary Bousquet
January 4, 2010, 4:44 pm
49 dayton st
spfld, Massachusetts 1106

KEEP THE INTERNET FREE we have enough to pay for here in the USA this is are only out for freedom still don't take it away from us.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Tracy Bovee
January 4, 2010, 4:44 pm
401 Lakeview Drive #202
Weston, Florida 33326-2404

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52: (he concept of an "open internet" can ONLY be maintained if it is left unencumbered by regulation. The moment government attempts to regulate it free and already-open access and content in ANY manner, it will no longer be any of those thing. History has shown time and again the government regulation only has a propensity for destroying, not improving. Therefore I, as a citizen of these United States, say "Nay" with regard to the proposed regulation.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Barry Bowdidge
January 4, 2010, 4:45 pm
1341 E. Valley Pkwy #152
Escondido, California 92027

Freedom is Freedom from Government! This is the purpose of the American Constitution. This is what makes us great and not just another failed Communist or Socialist country. As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

LYNN BOWMAN
January 4, 2010, 4:46 pm
412 Madison ave
CARY, North Carolina 27513

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Keep your hands out of our business!

CWO-3 BOB BOWMAN USMCR RETIRED

January 4, 2010, 4:47 pm

PO BOX 691508

ORLANDO, Florida 328691508

As an American who served his country to protect, defend, and preserve the freedoms we have in this country I am supporting Americans for Prosperity in supporting the opposition to a government takeover of the Internet. I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The Internet is private Enterprise and the government has not place involved in it.

Don Boyle
January 4, 2010, 4:48 pm
1811 Signature Ct.
Longmont, Colorado 80504

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In short, DON'T MESS WITH A GOOD THING!!!!!!

Susan Boyle
January 4, 2010, 4:49 pm
6840 W 83rd St Terrace
Bloomington, Minnesota 55438

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Lee Bradford
January 4, 2010, 4:50 pm
4312 Garth Road
Huntsville, Alabama 35802-1129

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,

Lee Bradford

Pat Bradley
January 4, 2010, 4:52 pm
2510 Electric Ln.
Suite 910
Dallas, Texas 75220

We are not Communist China. Stay out of our sources of information and communications. Every time a government (any government) does something to make things more fair or safer, they take control and make things less fair and less safe. Just stop trying to improve things and trust the people who use and pay for the services to make things better. As well as making them the way they want!

Johnie Brake
January 4, 2010, 4:53 pm
P.O. Box 1842
Claypool, Colorado 85532

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Keep your grubby hands off the internet.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Roberet Brandis
January 4, 2010, 4:55 pm
1517 Chatham Road
Camp Hill, Pennsylvania 17011

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Barbara Branscom
January 4, 2010, 4:55 pm
13687 Comuna Dr.
Poway, California 92064

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Leave the internet alone!!!!

Leslie Brasel
January 4, 2010, 4:55 pm
719 South Oak Grove Road
Cushing, Oklahoma 74023

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

WAY TO MUCH GOVERNMENT REGULATION AND CONTROL OVER OUR PERSONAL LIVES. IT HAS TO BE STOPPED

Jan Braverman
January 4, 2010, 4:58 pm
245 Princeton Road
Piscataway, New Jersey 8854

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely, for AFP,
Jan Braverman

Lin Brawley
January 4, 2010, 4:59 pm
5260 Fairview Rd
Baxter, Minnesota 56425

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

PS. Don't you all think you have your mitts in far too much of the Americans business? Most Americans are fed up with whats going on in the White House now. Jusr remember election time is just around the corner. This is America not some dumb commie country like you all are trying to turn it into.

Mary Breaux
January 4, 2010, 5:00 pm
101 Suffolk Ave
Lafayette, Louisiana 70508

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Keep the government out of the internet!!

Richard Brennan
January 4, 2010, 5:00 pm
6726 Big Springs Dr.
Arlington, Texas 76001

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Absolute Power Corrupts Absolutely. Keep Government small!

Ken Breuninger
January 4, 2010, 5:00 pm
921' N skyline
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74075

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Keep the federal government out of my life. They screw up everything they touch. Most of these programs are unconstitutional and un-American. Our government is corrupt to the bone.

Ben Brewer
January 4, 2010, 5:00 pm
333 W Leroux St G-4
Prescott, Arizona 86303

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank you,
Ben Brewer

Dennis Briggs
January 4, 2010, 5:00 pm
645 Howard Ave.
Billings, Montana 59101

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Tim Briggs
January 4, 2010, 5:00 pm
20111 Brondesbury
Katy, Texas 77450

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In my opinion, there is nothing that needs to be fixed, so why should government become involved?

David Briley
January 4, 2010, 5:00 pm
625 East Main St.
B-7
Hendersonville, Tennessee 37075

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Don't mess up a good thing to satisfy your ego. The government has messed up everything it touched. Err EGOS.

Carol Brinton
January 4, 2010, 5:01 pm
36 Shady Hollow Drive
Dearborn, Michigan 48124

To Whom It May Concern:

For once listen to the people!!!!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

William Brisko
January 4, 2010, 5:01 pm
2407 Beechwood Ave.
San Jose, California 95128

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Keep "Team Obama" out of the Internet!

Carl Brisson
January 4, 2010, 5:02 pm
17 Teaberry Lane
Bedford, New Hampshire 3110

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Keep your corrupt government paws off of the internet!

rollin brittner
January 4, 2010, 5:03 pm
13531 clairmont way #181
oregon city, Oregon 97045

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I think it's about time the government listened to the people, we are tired of the governments endless effort of regulating our lives. We already have way too much big government so stay out of our lives.

Kyle Broderick
January 4, 2010, 5:03 pm
12535 S. Ash Ave.
Jenks, Oklahoma 74037

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

AFP's concerns are well-founded. And in your own language your reasons for wanting to impose "net neutrality" or "open internet" seem justifiable. There are problems on the internet. You would like to alter web traffic to adhere to more controllable and "socially responsible" guidelines.

Here is the problem with your plan. Placing control into the hands of government agencies like your own is the worst scenario. You fear the "wild west", an uncontrolled and dangerous expanse. I know from reading my history, though, that the "wild west" is vastly preferable to your "civilized east." If the net remains free, there will be those that will take advantage. They will spread foul ideas, take too much power for personal profit, and use bandwidth for seemingly unnecessary things. There will be some bad stuff.

In your hands, however, the net will become a hollow shell of what it currently is or could be if left alone. It doesn't matter if your ideas are noble, or if your current plan truly is good. Either you or your successors would use your new-found power ruin this vastly powerful method of communication. You think the madness of the marketplace is inefficient? Government bureaucracies have proven themselves to be far worse.

What concerns me most, however, is how untrustworthy you are when it comes to abiding by the US Constitution and the principles of Liberty. I know that you or your successors would attempt to control the content of the internet. You would quash free speech in the name of some "greater good" when the political wind blows in your favor.

For this reason alone I have made up my mind. Your progress is not progress at all. Please get your hands away from the net.

H. J. Bronson
January 4, 2010, 5:04 pm
154 Aqua Vista Drive
Kerrville, Texas 78028-8865

Before I get to the specifics of why your planned actions are another attack on freedom I want you, the entire commission, to know that We the People will NOT stand for your attempt to subvert the Internet. Our patience are about out. Be cognizant that you will be held accountable and prohibited from any seizure PERIOD!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Spencer Bronte
January 4, 2010, 5:04 pm
23905 Clinton Keith 114-365
Wildomar, California 92595

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

As a citizen of the United States of America, I oppose fully!

Jeanette Brookes
January 4, 2010, 5:05 pm
2139 Tampico Dr.
Carrollton, Texas 75006

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

America is supposed to be a government of the people and by the people, not a government of a political elite who take over free enterprise. Leave free enterprise alone. It is able to take care of itself.

Roger A. Brooks
January 4, 2010, 5:05 pm
827 Golf Course Road
Gate City, Virginia 24251-3795

We don't need more Government control of the Internet. It would only screw it up, invade our privacy, and create more useless bureaucracy.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Helen Brosnan
January 4, 2010, 5:06 pm
4595 Saddlehorn Dr
same
Reno, Nevada 89511

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Enough already we are NOT a communist country, the government does not tell us what to do, we tell them. we are the people that speak. The sooner the Obamas realize that the better off we'll be.

Robert Brossman
January 4, 2010, 5:06 pm
2B, Elm Grove Crossings Mall
Wheeling, West Virginia 26003-5300

As an American concerned about any threat to Internet freedom, access and use, I urge the FCC to de-politicize any actions it may take in regard to keeping the Internet free of political influence.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please do not interfere with Internet freedom.

Carol Broussard
January 4, 2010, 5:07 pm
17527 Hawkin Lane
Tomball, Texas 77377

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Barry Brown
January 4, 2010, 5:07 pm
113 Woodmere Drive
Williamsburg, Virginia 23185-3976

In addition to the statement below, I want to reinforce the thought that the Internet, as it is now maintained and operated, does not need any government oversight or control. It is performing its function very well, since the inception, as a private enterprise. The laws of supply and demand must be utilized to insure this extremely important communications function continues to serve all who desire to gain benefit from its service.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Carol Brown
January 4, 2010, 5:07 pm
2603 NE 102nd St.
Vancouver, Washington 98686

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

No "Net Neutrality!"

Donald Brown
January 4, 2010, 5:09 pm
4105 Elizabeth Lane
4105 Elizabeth Lane
Fairfax, Virginia 22032

As an active internet user, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Companies should have the right to restrict traffic that is overwhelming their networks at their best judgment. That way small users will be able to have their messages go through as reward for not being data hogs.

Eldon Brown
January 4, 2010, 5:09 pm
1301 So. Mill ST.
Milton-Freewater, Oregon 97862-1153

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

?

james brown
January 4, 2010, 5:11 pm
4245 w. woodale avenue
brown deer, Wisconsin 53209

Private enterprise built the internet and the only reason government wants control is because it fears an unregulated internet. For that reason alone I oppose any and all governmental involvement, intrusion or control of the internet. It works fine without and further "fixing".

Government out of private enterprise. Government out of the internet.

Government's mandate is national defense, not social engineering. Stick with your mandate and leave private enterprise alone.

J.Brown
Brown Deer, Wisconsin

JAY BROWN
January 4, 2010, 5:11 pm
947 LANCE AVENUE
BALTIMORE, Maryland 21221

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. I THINK BIG GOVERNMENT IS STICKING ITS NOSE INTO TOO MUCH OF OUR PERSONAL RIGHTS. DON'T KEEP SENDING ME LETTERS OR REQUESTS FOR MONEY ETC. IT WILL JUST BE A WASTE OF TIME AND MONEY.

Jay Brown
January 4, 2010, 5:13 pm
6409 Fayetteville Rd.
Ste. 120-306
Durham, North Carolina 27713

I am submitting the following comments regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised un-Constitutional censorship over the Internet, there would be no alternative.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive, unjustified by any legitimate concerns, and will obstruct perfectly reasonable and economically efficient business models. This rulemaking will also impose unreasonable business uncertainty and create substantial increased litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the real ultimate goal of many proponents of such regulation.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been falsely ringing alarm bells now for many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”). Their claims should therefore be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of a substantial pattern or occurrence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no Constitutional justification for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In view of the clear prospects for a substantial shift in Congressional power following the mid-term election this Fall, the FCC would be wise to refrain from overplaying its hand in these matters.

Karen Brown
January 4, 2010, 5:14 pm
3285 New Baltimore Rd
Fayetteville, Pennsylvania 17222

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I couldn't have said it better myself...Karen Brown

Katrina Brown
January 4, 2010, 5:14 pm
1161 Cobblefield Way
Greenfield, Indiana 46140

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Lucy Brown
January 4, 2010, 5:15 pm
88 South Ave
New Canaan, Connecticut 6840

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

May GOD Bless America as we need his blessings!

Lygia Brown
January 4, 2010, 5:15 pm
4332 Teeter Totter Circle
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80917

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Robert Brown
January 4, 2010, 5:16 pm
3916 Shavano Dr.
Austin, Texas 78749

RobertAs an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sally Brown
January 4, 2010, 5:18 pm
40 Neubauer Drive
New Martinsville, West Virginia 26155

I have read the following article and agree that we should preserve the open net. We have enough government interference in our lives. Please -- NO MORE GOVERNMENT TAKE OVERS!!!!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Tim Brown
January 4, 2010, 5:18 pm
4179 Dawson Rd
Sedalia, Colorado 80135

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and may prevent business models that would be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Julie Bruce
January 4, 2010, 5:19 pm
500 Jaggy Lane
Poteet, Texas 78065

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Gerry Brundage
January 4, 2010, 5:19 pm
2219 Cemetery Rd
Pottsboro, Texas 75076

Keep your hands off my internet.

Ron and Joanne Brunetti
January 4, 2010, 5:19 pm
1404 S. Midland Heights Pl.
Covington, Virginia 24426-2348

As Americans for Prosperity activist, we are submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

We are especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Annette Bryant-Bridgeforth
January 4, 2010, 5:19 pm
251 Aspen Lane
Aurora, Illinois 60504

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Albert M Bryson
January 4, 2010, 5:20 pm
532 Third Avenue
Parkesburg, Pennsylvania 19365

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I totally opposed any government control of the internet.

Sarah Buck
January 4, 2010, 5:21 pm
4041 Mary Lane
Cedarburg, Wisconsin 53012

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should never set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Christina Buckner
January 4, 2010, 5:21 pm
1731 Wasatch Dr
Ogden, Utah 84403-1401

There is no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Period.

William Bucko
January 4, 2010, 5:21 pm
130 South Ave.
Mt. Clemens, Michigan 48043

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

KEEP YOUR HANDS OFF THE INTERNET!

PRIVATE PROPERTY IS PRIVATE PROPERTY! IF YOU WANT SOCIALISM, GET YOUR ASS TO CUBA WHERE YOU BELONG! AND TAKE THAT MARXIST BASTARD OBAMA WITH YOU!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dave Buerk
January 4, 2010, 5:22 pm
1210 Peggy dr
Hummelstown, Pennsylvania 17036

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

SICK BASTARDS - This is such a blatant attempt to gain control over free thought and exchanges of ideas. Un-American and an open door for abuse. NO! There is nothing Free OR American by trying to overload an incompetent Government in so many ways as we are seeing right now. Stalin and Mao would be proud. Castro and Chavez full of envy. NO!

David Bufalo
January 4, 2010, 5:24 pm
3193 S. Wilding Ct.
Denver, Colorado 80231

The internet is doing just fine without the FCC, so just stay out of the way. This is the last bastion of free enterprise left in America and unlike the government, it works quite well. There is no need for the government to get involved and screw it up. The following is a prepared statement, which I totally support.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Gary Buffon
January 4, 2010, 5:24 pm
6467 Conlon Ave
El Cerrito, California 94530-1612

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

At this point in time we need less government intervention, not more.

William A. Buie, Jr
January 4, 2010, 5:24 pm
212 Alex Drive
Jefferson City, Tennessee 37760

As an Americans for Prosperity supporter, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jane Bull
January 4, 2010, 5:24 pm
19 State Street
Carteret, New Jersey 7008

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

To be perfectly blunt, you need to keep your hands off the internet. It is doing very well without government intervention. How about creating some jobs instead of meddling where you don't belong?

Richard Bull
January 4, 2010, 5:25 pm
764 Guinda
Palo Alto, California 94301

As a working engineer in our National Defense industry, and as an individual who depends heavily upon the internet, I wish to make the following comments to GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

There is not one, single compelling reason for the government of the US to impose itself upon a system that works well, and serves public, private and business interests admirably, the financial self interest of some vocal advocates of regulation notwithstanding.

As a young man working in the communications industry, I was made aware of the acronym PICON; Public Interest, Convenience, Or Necessity. This was the guiding principle embraced by the FCC.

Increased regulation is not in the public interest, it certainly militates against convenience and is devoid of necessity. I wish to go on record as vehemently opposing any such regulatory action as is contemplated in the above captioned actions.

Richard Buller
January 4, 2010, 5:27 pm
4653 R.T. Cassidy Dr.
El Paso, Texas 79924

As an Americans for Prosperity citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Bruce Bullough
January 4, 2010, 5:28 pm
6946 Ideal Ave S
Cottage Grove, Minnesota 55016

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. As in all private/business operations, if a private company blocks or censors internet traffic it will lose customers. However, if government has control over the Internet, the consumer is lost, without recourse.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that become increasingly economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investment in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or, probably much worse, be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission has no Constitutionally granted authority (I read it frequently - no, it's no there!), and should not, on its own, set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims must be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that will have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, destroying job growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Brad bumgardner
January 4, 2010, 5:28 pm
po box 25
pinckard, Alabama 36371

Stop taking our freedom you fucking assholes!

Virginia Burd
January 4, 2010, 5:28 pm
10524 Walter Thompson Drive
Vienna, Virginia 22181

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Seth Burden
January 4, 2010, 5:29 pm
2224 Thornblade Dr
Raleigh, North Carolina 27604

On the idea of Government Internet Control...Get out! Good Grief. Control, Control, Control. Thats all that we hear about today from this administration. I thought America stood for freedom.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thomas Burdon
January 4, 2010, 5:29 pm
2205 N. Swan Rd.
Tucson, Arizona 85712

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

There is enough Government in our lives...This is unneeded.

Steven Burge
January 4, 2010, 5:29 pm
9525 W Coal Mine Ave
Apt D
Littleton, Colorado 80123

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Clyde Burke
January 4, 2010, 5:29 pm
P O Box 1708
Brookings, Oregon 97415

My comment is in regards to GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is just fine, without government controls. Forget it! Instead clamp down on the content sewer on TV.

Rodney Burket
January 4, 2010, 5:29 pm
2003 Lower Snake Spring Road
Everett, Pennsylvania 15536

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please consider that the internet is a place for our voices to be heard. It is not a place that government should control and limit our voices.

Jim Burnett
January 4, 2010, 5:30 pm
15410 N 2nd Place
Phoenix, Arizona 85022

As an IT professional and as an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense and we are behind most of the rest of the world in market penetration and broadband speeds.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Scott Burnett
January 4, 2010, 5:31 pm
140 South Central ave.
Cut Bank, Montana 59427

As an American I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mark Burnette
January 4, 2010, 5:31 pm
520 Lee St.
Evanston, Illinois 60202

I am in favor of an open internet and net neutrality, as are hundreds of millions of Americans and internet users around the globe.

Mason Burnette
January 4, 2010, 5:32 pm
314 Maxwell Lane
Newport News, Virginia 23606

As an American who loves LIBERTY as envisioned by our Constitution, I am against government interference with the internet.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no legitimate (i.e., no non-political) rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Aside from empowering government (political objective), most government "fairness" activity of late has done more to limit FREEDOM than protect it. Consequently, I oppose any new government regulation of the internet.

Mike Burns
January 4, 2010, 5:32 pm
32349 Hwy 92
Hotchkiss, Colorado 81419

To whom it may concern, Keep your grubby lunchhooks off the internet! Are you kidding me? This proposal (GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52) is just another power grab by the wanna be socialists currently in power. I will do everything in my power in 2010 and 2012 to make sure those responsible for this proposal and/or other similar legislation get voted (read FIRED) right out of there jobs! As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Very Sincerely, Mike Burns

Ronald Burns
January 4, 2010, 5:32 pm
1575 Leonard Pt. Road
Oshkosh, Wisconsin 54904

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The arguments on both sides of this issue are well known by the FCC and the media. I know that my comments reflect thousands Americans just like me, and we do not want government or any other entity to have the power of intervention in any of the media to filter or control any aspect of it. Plainly speaking, it is a competitive environment that will govern and control itself. Like television, news, radio and other media, consumers will stop trading with those they find offensive, unprofitable or otherwise unwanted.

Families have the power to control the exposure of themselves and their children. Private entities can and already are doing the same.

The question of go or no-go forward with intervention is simple contrary to everything the U.S. Constitution is all about. Do not forget this truth.

Ronald Burns
1575 Leonard Point Road
Oshkosh, WI 54904
920.420.3314

T BUSICK
January 4, 2010, 5:32 pm
44 FIRST
ANN ARBOR, Michigan 48108

HISTORY WOULD SHOW THAT YOU PUT AN END TO FREEDOM OF SPEECH NOT TO MENTION, BE AWARE OF YOU BEING STOPPED OF YOUR FREEDOM OF SPEECH, NEXT ADMINISTRATION. FEELS DIFFERENT WHEN SOMEONE DOES IT TO YOU. YOU WILL NOT BE IN POWER LONG, YOUR EXTREME CHANGES ARE SIMPLY MAKING THAT HAPPEN SOONER, INSTEAD OF LATER.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

tT BUSICK
January 4, 2010, 5:32 pm
44 FIRST
ANN ARBOR, Michigan 48108

YOU WILL GO DOWN IN HISTORY AS THE CENSORSHIP ADMINISTRATION OF OUR HISTORY.....NICE.....BE CAREFUL....WHATEVER YOU PUT ON US....WILL GO BACK ON YOU.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Brenda Butler
January 4, 2010, 5:33 pm
1372 W Glenmere dr
Chandler, Arizona 85224

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

NO MORE Government messing in private Companies. Enough is enough.

Janice Butler
January 4, 2010, 5:34 pm
5430 Chickadee Court
kjgkhg
Parker, Colorado 94566

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Scott & Ruth Butler
January 4, 2010, 5:35 pm
818 Cass Road
Traverse City, Michigan 49684

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

HANDS OFF!

Larry D. Butler, Ph.D.
January 4, 2010, 5:35 pm
2490 - 5500 Rd.
Delta, Colorado 81416

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The government has no right, granted by our Constitution, that limits free speech or expression and that includes thoughts and speech passed over the Internet! In fact it would be Unconstitutional to pass an regulation or law that prevented or even limited the same!

Nelson Butz
January 4, 2010, 5:36 pm
1275 Rock Ave. Apt. B7
North Plainfield, New Jersey 7060

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,
Nelson Butz

Peter Buxton
January 4, 2010, 5:37 pm
38981 23rd Street
Mattawan, Michigan 49071

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is not run by coercion. It is run by consensus over the TCP/IP suite and by voluntary fees. The call by the Orwellian group "Open Internet" for those standards to be placed entirely in the hands of the Government is a self-parodic travesty: as if a group called "Open Books" insisted that all printing presses be owned by the government and that all books be marketed the same, printed on the same size paper, &c.

I am very curious, though: how will the FCC, La Pelosi and the One We Have Been Waiting For pry the standards for HTTP/HTML/XML out of the hands of the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C)? The European non-profit will not take kindly to an American takeover.

If the FCC wants to do something useful, break up state-wide monopolies to the township level, and let them run co-ops or contract to telecoms/cable cos. to provide the vast majority of their citizens with net.access.

Susan Crawford and Robert McChesney want to turn the US into Communist China, with our own Great Firewall. No, thank you.

Yours,

Peter Buxton

Jack Buzbee
January 4, 2010, 5:37 pm
200 E Douglas St
De Soto, Illinois 62924

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility would be a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

bwotefhbtkn bwotefhbtkn
January 4, 2010, 5:38 pm
sBfAlTxLau
HNWPiOVjST
New York, North Carolina 7586

J1xORz qqdjontjhngp, [url=http://qdbauplrzaff.com/]qdbauplrzaff[url],
[link=http://nohfkwoihlv.com/]nohfkwoihlv[/link], http://ikjmmvqhheq.com/

Kent Byington
January 4, 2010, 5:38 pm
1741 Conifer Ridge
Prescott, Arizona 86303

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The government has no legitimate right to interfere with speech and free enterprise. The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Amelia C.
January 4, 2010, 5:38 pm
Hope
White Twp., New Jersey 7823

, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Nancy Cable
January 4, 2010, 5:38 pm
1211 W. Crow
Webb City, Missouri 64870

I am sending my message of utter protest against Washington restricting the current internet system through the FCC enacting the "Open Internet" rules. It is my constitutional right to have total freedom of speech and communication. I do not want any government interference with this right. Thank you.

Richard E. Cadle
January 4, 2010, 5:39 pm
11975 Blott Rd.
North Jackson, Ohio 44451

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

LEAVE the INTERNET alone. If you want to "FIX" the INTERNET and be productive at the FCC block spammers, viruses, trojans and worms.

Elizabeth Cadwalader
January 4, 2010, 5:39 pm
1130 Oak St.
Coatesville, Pennsylvania 19320

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

STOP THIS MADNESS NOW. WE ARE THE USA, NOT RUSSIA, NOT CHINA FOR GODS SAKE!!!!!!!!!! YOU ARE ALL PITIFULL WEAK PEOPLE WHO FEAR FREE SPEACH.

John Caldwell
January 4, 2010, 5:39 pm
Talisman Lane
Huntington Beach, California 92649

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dan O. Caldwell III
January 4, 2010, 5:39 pm
P.O. Box 1504
Lander, Wyoming 82520

There is too much government regulation and control now that does not come from the people, but some government agency. FCC regulation of the internet is another such control that is not needed or wanted. If the FCC were to pass these regulations, who is going to oversee the FCC. If internet regulation is needed, it should come from our Congress and not from an agency.

Kenneth Calman
January 4, 2010, 5:40 pm
6320 W. Saguaro Dr.
Glendale, Arizona 85304

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We are not China! Not yet, unless you turn us into that kind of tyranny.

Kenneth Calman
January 4, 2010, 5:40 pm
6320 W. Saguaro Dr.
Glendale, Arizona 85304

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In addition to the above: THIS IS NOT CHINA!

David Cambiano
January 4, 2010, 5:41 pm
25 Sandstone Drive
Conway, Arkansas 72034

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am sorely troubled by all the idiots in Congress and the Whitehouse who have made themselves the enemy of this great country. You can all go to hell.

Samuel Camden
January 4, 2010, 5:41 pm
341 Douglas Ave
Crystal Lake, Illinois 60014

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

And, remember, the Government is of the people, by the people, and for the people. It is to serve the people, NOT the other way around.

Alan Campbell
January 4, 2010, 5:41 pm
W164 N11139 Kings Way
Germantown, Wisconsin 53022

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not, on its own, set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Scott Campbell
January 4, 2010, 5:41 pm
2017 Freeman Lk Rd
Oldtown, Idaho 83822

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The internet is the embodiment of free speech and it must not be censored, regulated, or taken over by the government.

james Cannon
January 4, 2010, 5:43 pm
1572 Meisner Rd
East China, Michigan 48054

PLEASE..... do not add more "GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS" to our lives, there is already too much "BIG GOVERNMENT" control in my life. I firmly believe government should be made "SMALLER, NOT LARGER".
WASHINGTON IS ELECTED TO DO THE WILL OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE, NOT THE OTHER WAY AROUND !!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Leon Cannon
January 4, 2010, 5:44 pm
544 S. Abbey
Mesa, Arizona 85208

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We need less government, not more. Americans are getting tired of the government involvement in every aspect of our lives. The Internet, an American invention, should be free from government involvement and restrictions and allow unfettered access of data to all freedom loving people across the world.

Sincerely,
Leon Cannon

James & Carla Cantelmo
January 4, 2010, 5:44 pm
925 Stillwater Road
Newton, New Jersey 7860

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, we are submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Joseph Caputo
January 4, 2010, 5:44 pm
237 N. Governors Avenue
Dover, Delaware 19904

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Trevor Card
January 4, 2010, 5:45 pm
151 Hazelnut Drive
Fernley, Nevada 89408

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

What the hell is wrong with you control freaks in Washington.

MaryLou Carden
January 4, 2010, 5:46 pm
4056 Lee Circle
Wheat Ridge, Colorado 80033-4152

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am against government control of the Internet which would increasingly diminish our freedom of expression and freedom of enterprise and competition in Internet services. In the following statements, I agree with the content that opposes the increasing advance of government takeover of methods of communication through control and/or ownership of the Internet. This promotes the slippery slope of loss of the cherished American freedoms of dissent and individual rights to full expression of thoughts and beliefs.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

I am against government control of the Internet which would increasingly diminish our freedom of expression and freedom of enterprise and competition in Internet services.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Greg Carkhuff
January 4, 2010, 5:46 pm
30 Overlook Drive
Amherst, Massachusetts 1002

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I think the government should stay out of the internet business. All great discoveries have come from the private sector and not government. The only thing the government has proven it can do well is to spend money and muck things up. There is a need for government in areas such as defense, security, intrastate policing and such but the internet is not one of them. The government should not have the power to step into the private sector and regulate anything they want at anytime.

Richard Carl
January 4, 2010, 5:46 pm
217 Pine St.
Apt. 5
Attleboro, Massachusetts 2703

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Melissa Carlson
January 4, 2010, 5:47 pm
4313 Plaza Lane
St. Cloud, Minnesota 56303

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Denise Carman
January 4, 2010, 5:47 pm
6748 Canterbury Drive
Highland, Utah 84003

A transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The FCC should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

I strongly oppose any government controls that would restrict freedom of decent speech on the internet, or access to the internet by the general public.

Heather Carman
January 4, 2010, 5:47 pm
7329 1/2 11th Ave NW
Seattle, Washington 98117

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I adamantly oppose the proposed FCC regulations relating to the internet in GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52.

The following are a few of my reasons.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Respectfully,

Heather Carman

Steve Carner
January 4, 2010, 5:47 pm
11906 Marble Rd.
Yakima, Washington 98908

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the .

lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become

Mark Carney
January 4, 2010, 5:47 pm
4304 Holiday Ave
Union Gap, Washington 98903

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behaviour, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sara Caron
January 4, 2010, 5:47 pm
111 E Glenwood St
Nashua, New Hampshire 3060

I agree with the statement herein save I added a personal note at the end of this statement.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I do not wish to have the government involved in the matters of the Internet.

Chris Carpenter
January 4, 2010, 5:48 pm
1557 Hamlet St
Lincolnton, North Carolina 28092

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank you
Chris Carpenter

David Carpenter
January 4, 2010, 5:49 pm
1100 Hayden
Moses Lake, Washington 98837

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The bottom line is, #1: LESS government restriction and regulations! #2: Term limits to all elected officials!
#3: Elect NO Incumbants!!! It is obvious that they all are corrupt and have no respect for the Constitution of the United States!

Neil Carpenter
January 4, 2010, 5:49 pm
3080 Wadsworth Blvd.
Wheat Ridge, Colorado 80033

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I am vehemently opposed to any such net neutrality or open internet meddling by the FCC or any Federal entity or regulatory agency.
Neil Carpenter

Richard Carpenter
January 4, 2010, 5:49 pm
13413 Crestwood Ct.
Wichita, Kansas 67230

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I don't want more government regulations in my life. Stop this foolishness now.

Robbie Carpenter
January 4, 2010, 5:50 pm
2525 NW 40
2525 NW 40
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73112

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

stan carper
January 4, 2010, 5:50 pm
9829 se 42nd place
mercier island, Washington 98040

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Keep it up and Jefferson Davis will rise again.

Robert Carruth
January 4, 2010, 5:50 pm
314 Abbot Ave
Worthington, Ohio 43085

As an individual concerned American citizen , I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Further I believe this is a direct violation of my right to freedom of speech and association protected under the US Constitution. The internet started as a means of communication for information on research and subsequently morphed into the contemporary means of gathering and communication information and in many respects has assumed the role of a free press (an other constitutionally protected right). At no time in history have such rights coexisted with a central government where the central government had the ability to exercise regulatory or confiscatory control.

susan Carry
January 4, 2010, 5:50 pm
PO Box
Quincy, Illinois 62305

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

WE are a FREE COUNTRY and WE THE PEOPLE demand that these Communistic and dictatorship / socialistic ways stop IMMEDIATLY!

Louis Cartabona
January 4, 2010, 5:51 pm
1119 Fifth Ave
Alpha, New Jersey 8865

Please,

I am attaching a well thought out letter to get you to know the gist of my argument. read below:

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Susan Carter
January 4, 2010, 5:51 pm
442 W Santa Elena
Palm Springs, California 92262

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

"Net neutrality" is just one more play by the government to grab power and control our lives. We, the People, will not stand for it.

Teresa Casalino
January 4, 2010, 5:51 pm
1901 Bloomingdale Ave
Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17601

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

bonnie casassa
January 4, 2010, 5:53 pm
1 greenville circle
rochdale, Massachusetts 1542

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We need your help to preserve our freedoms.... of speech, religion and all that the constitution has given us.

Janet Casavan
January 4, 2010, 5:54 pm
3111 Manorwood Drive
Bryan, Texas 77801

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

"BUTT OUT OF OUR LIVES AND BUSINESSES"

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Debora Case
January 4, 2010, 5:55 pm
5848 Bridal Tr
Fort Worth, Texas 76179

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Retain the status-quo!

Donald Cash
January 4, 2010, 5:55 pm
3986 Niles Terrace
Ooltewah, Tennessee 37363

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

"Open Internet" or "net neutrality" sounds simple - force phone and cable companies to treat every bit of information the same way - until you realize that modern networks are incredibly complex, with millions of lines of code in every router. Making sure services like VoIP, video conferencing, and telemedicine (not to mention the next great thing that hasn't been invented yet) get priority may be necessary to make the Internet work, but the government is considering regulations that will make it illegal to prioritize traffic.

These networks cost billions of dollars to build and maintain, and if there is uncertainty about getting a good return on that investment, private investment will dry up.

The internet should be left alone. No government involvement is needed.

Sincerely,

Donald R. Cash

John Cassil
January 4, 2010, 5:56 pm
PO Box 40492
Charleston, South Carolina 29423

HANDS OFF THE INTERNET!!!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James Catalanotto
January 4, 2010, 5:57 pm
10010 Asheville Dr.
Denham Springs, Louisiana 70706

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Please don't interfere in this most vibrant and free aspect of Human Culture. As in the case of the most recent example of Government intervention in the economic life of the American People that has resulted in a housing bubble and resulting debt crisis that still threatens the entirety of the World's financial system, the Law of Unintended consequences will once again reveal the stupidity of those that forsake human freedom and the Market Place of Ideas for some elite driven concept of human and societal perfectibility. Please leave the Internet alone. Please let market forces and competition continue to work out the supply and demand issues involving bandwidth without the imposition of rules from this body.

Also, I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Carroll Cawyer
January 4, 2010, 5:58 pm
1433 N. Dale
Stephenville, Texas 76401

I am opposed to ANY government regulation of the internet. The government now has too much power over too many industries, more than is rightly constitutional. The internet is international in scope and should not be infringed upon by any government, including the U.N.

David Caylor
January 4, 2010, 5:59 pm
9121 Villa Ridge Drive
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. I support a truly open, competitive, privately owned and controlled network. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. Let Government create its own network to COMPETE with privately owned networks. Competition is good. But DON'T INSERT GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS to "MUCK UP" the successful Privately owned networks.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Gary Cearfoss
January 4, 2010, 5:59 pm
510 Line Ave.
Ellwood City, Pennsylvania 16117

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Keep the internet free!

Harrison Chaess
January 4, 2010, 5:59 pm
1034 beaumont Road
Berwyn, Pennsylvania 19312

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I want the FCC to keep their hands off the Internet. I do not want you to attempt to abridge my freedom of speech. Follow the rules set in our Constitution, Amendment I.

Mana, Mark, Zac, Conner and Chris Chaffin
January 4, 2010, 5:59 pm
P.O. Box 199
Lillian, Texas 76061

LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE... IT DOES NOT NEED GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION ... WE ARE ENTITLED TO FREE SPEECH AND COMMUNICATION AND GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT COMPETE BUSINESS.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

KM Chaney
January 4, 2010, 5:59 pm
2566 West Ladle Rapids St.
Meridian, Idaho 835646

Will you listen to we, the people and not be fooled by those who want government regulation over all American enterprise? As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Rosemarie & Robert L Chanin
January 4, 2010, 5:59 pm
2505 East Bay Drive #167
Largo, Florida 33771

Mr. OBAMA,
Brings Socialism-Communism, thru a totalitarian Government.
RC

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Donald Channing
January 4, 2010, 6:00 pm
80 Bishop Branch Lane SE
Leland, North Carolina 28451

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

To maintain free and open access to the internet the FCC should exercise extreme regulatory restraint. Free markets and private ownership have built, managed and maintained the internet for over two decades responsibly and without exclusionary practices. Do not stifle the growth of this industry by burdening a growing, thriving economic engine with regulations born from unfounded fear of denial of service.

ERIK CHAPIN
January 4, 2010, 6:00 pm
74-567 HONOKOHAU ST.
KAILUA KONA, Hawaii 96740

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.
DO NOT GO THERE !!!

Ronald Chapman
January 4, 2010, 6:00 pm
26W144 Armbrust
Wheaton, Illinois 60187

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

GET THE GOVERNMENT OUT OF OUR LIVES, LET COMPETITION RULE.

William Chase
January 4, 2010, 6:00 pm
6719 Gateline
Richmond, Virginia 23234

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The internet should be totally FREE

Connie Chevis
January 4, 2010, 6:01 pm
400 Drinkwater Rd
Bay St Louis, Mississippi 39520

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,
Connie Chevis

Vikki Childs
January 4, 2010, 6:01 pm
363 Sansbury Road
Friendship, Maryland 20758

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

No to government takeover of the Internet.

Robert Chiles, Jr
January 4, 2010, 6:01 pm
1212 green springs rd
New Bern, North Carolina 28560

As a early user of the usenet, and a current operator of an wireless internet sevice provider, I fain any attempt to force the internet into a FCC regulated and thus controlled government utility abhorrent. I agree with AFP, om this point.

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Billy Chivers
January 4, 2010, 6:01 pm
420 Holly St.
Grapevine, Texas 76051

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jeanne Chorzempa
January 4, 2010, 6:03 pm
3660 Indian Hills Drive
Lake Havasu City, Arizona 86406

As an Americans for Prosperity activist and an American that works online every day, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Leif Christensen
January 4, 2010, 6:03 pm
2145 Sanborn Court
North Pole, Alaska 99705

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Greg Christy
January 4, 2010, 6:03 pm
825 Heritage Dr
Lima, Ohio 45804

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We do not need any further government involvement in th public communications.

Tnak you,
Greg Christy

cialis vs viagra cialis vs viagra

January 4, 2010, 6:05 pm

ezvyhfhq@nhtvztoa.com

ezvyhfhq@nhtvztoa.com

uAJuKIRL, Mississippi XGGQAFUUK

comment1, cialis, [url="http://nuevascarreras.com/tag/cialis-generico/"]cialis[/url], http://nuevascarreras.com/tag/cialis-generico/ cialis, 558,

Robert Cihak
January 4, 2010, 6:05 pm
21310 Poplar Way
Brier, Washington 98036

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic it would lose its customers and legal redress would be possible. However, if government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices creates uncertainty and litigation risks. Such restrictions would cause investors and existing networks to hesitate on or cancel plans to expand.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, inevitably politicizing the process.

Look, Congress is already doing enough damage. You really don't have to join in the destruction. The Commission should not on its own set into motion these destructive changes, even if pressured by Congress.

The so-called “net neutrality” is just more vaporware.

Please don't further slow down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the current, competitive Internet has become.

Robert Cirr
January 4, 2010, 6:06 pm
537 West Century Ave
Gilbert, Arizona 85233

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Finally...the government has no constitutional authority over the internet. As a citizen I say..."Keep out of private communication!

Constance Clapper
January 4, 2010, 6:07 pm
PO Box 200
West Fulton, New York 12194

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

I do NOT want Washington to take over ANYTHING. We are losing our Freedoms every day and soon there will be NONE left. Can anything be done to change what has already taken place????

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Annette Clark
January 4, 2010, 6:08 pm
N1852 Speller Lane
Reeseville, Wisconsin 53579

Ma Bell was broken up years ago due being an empire lacking checks and balances competition offers...now the gov't thinks it has the right to be the Ma Bell of the internet with no public input as to how it is run. The turn America going is unconstitutional.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Bill Clark
January 4, 2010, 6:08 pm
1028 Mackey Pk
Nicholasville, Kentucky 40356

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Give me a break! The power grab is so evident, freedom of info. infringement, and so on. There is no need for this. How about protecting myself and my family and quit using my resources for idiotic things that are unneeded.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

CATHERINE CLARK
January 4, 2010, 6:09 pm
3900 W. DAKIN ST.
CHICAGO, Illinois 60618

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

I ALSO PERSONALLY OPPOSE HANDING THE INTERNET TO THE MAJOR COMPANIES SO THAT THEY CAN CHARGE FOR EVERY LITTLE THING! THEY DIDN'T INVENT, IT THEY SHOULDN'T CONTROL IT, EITHER. i WANT THE GOVERNMENT AND BIG BUSINESS TO LEAVE THE INTERNET THE FLACK ALONE. IT BELONGS TO EVERYONE; NOT TO AT&T, NOT TO COMCAST, NOT TO ANY COMPANY SO THAT THEY CAN CONTROL THE FLOW OF INFORMATION AND DENY FILE SHARING. STAY THE FLACK OUT OF THE INTERNET. LEAVE IT ALONE.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Marcus Clark
January 4, 2010, 6:10 pm
128 Canyon Road
Clayton, North Carolina 27520

As an American Taxpayer, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Rosina Clarke
January 4, 2010, 6:10 pm
12710 S. 71st Street
Papillion, Nebraska 68133

I DON'T WANT THE GOVERNMENT TO TAKE OVER/CONTROL THE INTERNET!!! KEEP IT PRIVATE...WE ARE AMERICANS!!!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Bob Cleary
January 4, 2010, 6:10 pm
5358 Lea St
San Diego, California 92105

Bob Cleary, an American, in regards to preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank You for your concern an wise choices.

Bob Cleary
BobC@ctiNetwork.com

Alex Clement
January 4, 2010, 6:11 pm
163 Rigi Ave
Syracuse, New York 13206

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I respectfully ask that you not attempt to regulate our internet. I have lived in places such as China with regulated and censored internet, and have chosen instead to live in freedom in the United States of America.

Mari Jo Cline
January 4, 2010, 6:12 pm
8080 State Hwy 78 West
Lot 21
Beulah, Colorado 81023

Hello:

It would be most appreciated if you would Please honor my requests as follows:

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank you.
Sincerely,
Mari Jo Cline

Robert Cline
January 4, 2010, 6:12 pm
1880 Brookwood Ave
Apt 413
Burlington, North Carolina 27215-3208

As a freedom loving American , I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet.
GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn and government personell would have free rein to obstruct another freedom we enjoy in the USA.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

DO NOT CAUSE ME TO LOOSE MY FREEDOM ON THE INTERNET !!

DeWitt Clinton
January 4, 2010, 6:13 pm
96 Pocatello Road
Middletown, New York 10940

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,

DeWitt L. Clinton

Tony Coble
January 4, 2010, 6:16 pm
102 Silver Fox Circle
Goldsboro, North Carolina 27530

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

PS: JUST GET THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OUT OF OUR LIVES.

Rebecca Cockrell
January 4, 2010, 6:16 pm
1250 Lone Star Road
Rose Bud, Arkansas 72137

I am against any so-called net-neutrality. Please do not go any further with this crippling regulation. It will destroy the power of the internet and strangle the effectiveness of our systems. It is simply a way for far-leftists to have control over the rights of a communication system that is, so far, free. Keep it that way.....

Robert Coffman
January 4, 2010, 6:17 pm
2064 Atwood Terrace
Coshocton, Ohio 43812

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Plus I do not want the government involved with the interneret in any way, shape or form. Please do not restrict the internet in any way. Robert Coffman, Coshocton, Ohio

Joan Cohen
January 4, 2010, 6:17 pm
19 Walden Place
Great Neck, New York 11020

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This is an invasion of privacy. The gov'n't has no place in controlling the internet. This sounds like Chavez's gov'n't policies to control the citizens!

Carol Cole
January 4, 2010, 6:17 pm
8120 Snow Hill Rd
Salisbury, Maryland 21804

RE:GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am opposed to the contemplated "open internet" or "net neutrality". In it's current unregulated state, the internet is unique as a free and unregulated form of communication allowing unbridled competition and innovation. The proposals contained in the above referenced item will stifle competition and innovation mirroring the decline in our economy due to government interference.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Joseph Cole
January 4, 2010, 6:17 pm
252 Willow Rock Point
Fayetteville, Georgia 30215

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I do not want the FCC to implement any more regulations or have any control in regulating the flow of data and information on the Internet.

Claudia Coleman
January 4, 2010, 6:19 pm
3379 Youngs Rd
Southern Pines, North Carolina 28387

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I fully support this position.

Stan Coleman
January 4, 2010, 6:20 pm
216 S. Ingalls
#3
Grand Island, Nebraska 68803

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Well there goes high quality Video Conferencing over the open and "free" internet. I work in an environment where we use lots of Video Conferencing. While it works great on our privately owned and prioritized network it doesn't work good on the open internet. Two years ago we found some serious quality issues over our own WAN. After many meetings and discussions it was discovered that the Video Conferencing (VC) traffic was being treated with the same priority as the reset of the traffic. If you go a head with Net Neutrality you will limit the growth of VC over the public internet. Instead of companies being able to purchase prioritized traffic to make their VC systems work flawlessly on the public internet they will be forced to purchase dedicated private lines. So while you say this is to free up the system your actually putting a hold on growth in the area of VC.

Prioritized traffic is critical to VC in order to preserve quality. When you read an email or surf the net the order in which you receive packets is irrelevant. If the last part of your email comes in first and the first comes in last you don't care or even notice. Do you care if the bottom of your web pages comes in first and then the top part...no? Priority for surfing the network and for email isn't important. Now do the same thing for VC. Let the 3rd second come in first and then have the 1st second come in followed by the 5th and then the 2nd second would create an unviewable picture. Getting the information to come in in the proper sequence can only be achieved by giving that traffic a higher priority than the reset of the traffic.

The use of Video Conferencing will allow more people to drive and fly less which will allow the planet to become greener. So it's not only in the best interest of Video Conferencing to have prioritized traffic it's also in the best interest of a greener planet.

Vickie Coleman
January 4, 2010, 6:21 pm
6066 Vale Meade Circle
Helena, Alabama 35080

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

THIS IS A FREEDOM OF SPEECH ISSUE, PLAIN AND SIMPLE. AND AS SUCH, ACCORDING TO THE CONSTITUTION, YOU DO NOT HAVE THE RIGHT TO SILENCE MY VOICE!

john colicigno
January 4, 2010, 6:22 pm
596 seybert st
hazleton, Pennsylvania 18201-4450

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

***PS - MY VOTE SAYS NO INTERNET INTERFERENCE! NOVEMBER IS CLOSE AT HAND. I WILL SEEK RETRIBUTIONS! John G.COLICIGNO**

Joseph Colucci
January 4, 2010, 6:23 pm
16 Autumn Drive
Howell, New Jersey 7731

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Virtually everything you touch is less effective, less profitable, less efficient and less equitable than it is prior to your involvement. Leave it alone. I do not want you to advance your agenda, whatever it may be, at my expense any longer. I make my living in large part due to the internet and I am sure you will adversely effect my ability to provide for my family and in turn pay your bloated salaries if you get involved. Please find something else to ruin that will not have such a devastating impact on society.

Margaret Conahan
January 4, 2010, 6:23 pm
37 Vly Rd
first floor
Colonie, New York 12205

I feel our freedoms are being taken over and this is just one more thing that the government has no business being involved in. As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Rebecca Cone
January 4, 2010, 6:24 pm
6201 Bert Kouns
841
Shreveport, Louisiana 71129

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Sometimes I wonder if I have moved to another country? We are the United States of America, the land of the free. Why is the government trying to have power over everything the citizens of our great Country try to do. The illegal aliens have more freedom and more benefits than the tax-paying Americans of our Nation. May God Help Us. Oh, yes that is not politically correct anymore. No wonder our Country is in such dire straights. God is great and needs to be put back in our Country as the Divine ruler over all!!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dave Connell
January 4, 2010, 6:25 pm
3055 Alta Laguna Blvd.
Laguna Beach, California 92651

As a Veteran, a patriot, and an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jenann Connolly
January 4, 2010, 6:25 pm
762 Ardmore Street
Dearborn Heights, Michigan 48127

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Peter K. Connolly
January 4, 2010, 6:25 pm
304
New Haven, Missouri 63068

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This Madministration is pushing American citizens too far.

Alan Conroy
January 4, 2010, 6:26 pm
14016 35th Avenue South
Tukwila, Washington 98168

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The internet, and access to it, are working just fine. We do not need, nor do we want, the government to get involved and screw it up. Stop trying to fix that which is not broken. Keep out of our internet!

Robert Considine
January 4, 2010, 6:26 pm
720 9th Ave.
Fulton, Illinois 61252

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The government does not make things run better. All it does is add cost and take away our freedom. Why would anyone support that? The only reason I can think of is those who do not care about how things run but do care about control, control at all cost.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Karen Constant
January 4, 2010, 6:27 pm
524 Paso de Oro Dr
Lake Havasu City, Arizona 86404

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

KEEP YOUR COTTON PICKING HANDS OFF MY INTERNET! YOU ALREADY HAVE ENOUGH TO SCREW UP.

Martha Conway
January 4, 2010, 6:28 pm
833 Bourbon Red Drive
St Louis, Missouri 63131

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The Internet is NOT a public utility!

Daniel Cook
January 4, 2010, 6:28 pm
8030 Oak Hollow Lane
Fairfax Station, Virginia 22039

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Glenn Cook
January 4, 2010, 6:29 pm
8114 N 54th Street
Paradise Valley, Arizona 85253

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

As with everything else in America, private enterprise is much more efficient and capable of providing quality service than a government enterprise.

Joe Cook
January 4, 2010, 6:30 pm
1408 Broadway St.
Chico, California 95928

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of "preserving the open Internet". GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the ill advised desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. _The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path._

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

To summarize, this NPRM is ill advised and unnecessary. The Internet should be allowed to continue to develop without further Government regulation or intervention.

Joe Cook

Judy Cook
January 4, 2010, 6:30 pm
2502 Hague SW
Wyoming, Michigan 49519

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Robert Cook
January 4, 2010, 6:31 pm
630 N. cr 600 W
Greenfield, Indiana 46140

My email is personal, just like putting a letter in an envelope and sealing it and mailing it vial the U. S. Postal service. I expect the internet to be the same way. It is no business of the U. S. government what email I send unless it is pornographic. Leave the internet alone and keep the government out of my business.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Virginia Cook
January 4, 2010, 6:31 pm
p.o. box 2777
broken arrow, Oklahoma 74013

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. I am against anything which would limit the freedom of speech on it, or anything which would make it a government entity. I am against govt. ownership of it as well. Thank you for listening to my opinion.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Kay Cooksley
January 4, 2010, 6:32 pm
PO Box 937
Canyonville, Oregon 97417

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Government needs to do the job that they were intended to do. Government does not need to get more jobs- They are dabbling in areas never intended.

Thank you for your time,

Kay Cooksley

Joanne Cooper
January 4, 2010, 6:33 pm
59 Cemetery Road
Woodstown, New Jersey 8098

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Michael Cooper
January 4, 2010, 6:34 pm
1546 8th Ave
Longview, Washington 98632

Stop taking away our American freedoms!
The US government has already stifled new invention creation!
Barack Hussein Obama will destroy the USA if we Americans let him.
DON'T LET HIM!!!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

edith cord
January 4, 2010, 6:34 pm
6167 llanfair drive
columbia, Maryland 21044

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Remember Jefferson: that government governs best that governs least. Give us some freedom. Stop encroaching into our lives. Focus instead on the real threats to our national security where the list of your duties is long.

Alice Cormaci
January 4, 2010, 6:35 pm
228 Blue Crane 1 Dr.
Slidell, Louisiana 70461

The Internet does not belong to the government -- it belongs to the private investors who built it and the millions of users who contribute to it.

The federal government has no enumerated power to intervene in uses of the internet beyond violation of criminal statutes. Though the internet was beyond a dream at the founding of our country, comparisons can be made. Would the authors of the Constitution or our early leaders granted the Federal government to "regulate" bulletin boards? The content of privately published books? Of course not!

At this time, the internet remains one of a scarce few forums which is truly open to free speech, which is itself a right enumerated to the people. The "Open Internet" moniker is itself an insult to the citizenry this would be imposed upon.

A federal regulatory power to "police" the internet is a true affront to the rights of the individuals who built it and who use it every day, and for this basic reason, I am wholly against new regulatory authority over it. Most disturbingly, that it is being sought as an unchecked executive branch power.

Most Sincerely,
Alice Cormaci
Slidell, LA

Laird Cormell
January 4, 2010, 6:35 pm
2340 Hwy 180 E #199
Silver City, New Mexico 88061

The internet has grown up as a wonderfully free media. We do not need additional federal regulation and bureaucracy. Despite the fact that the proposals are touted as "open internet" - federal regulators do two things: regulate and grow their bureaucracies.

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Carl Cornealy
January 4, 2010, 6:36 pm
3931 Grand Central PL W
Jacksonville, Florida 32246-7640

PLEASE LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Donale Cornwell
January 4, 2010, 6:36 pm
P.O.B. 3510
St. Johns, Arizona 85936

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We don't need any government mandates in any area of our pursuit of happiness. If it ain't broke don't fix it

Raymond Corper
January 4, 2010, 6:37 pm
13500 Turtle Marsh Loop #816
Orlando, Florida 32837

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

HANDS OFF!

Patricia Corriell
January 4, 2010, 6:37 pm
1541 Kelly Avenue
Atalissa, Iowa 52720

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

KEEP THE GOVERNMENT FAR, FAR AWAY FROM THE INTERNET. REDUCE THE POWERS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, NOT EXPAND THEM.

steve costa
January 4, 2010, 6:37 pm
po box 146
barnstead, New Hampshire 3225

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

RB Cotter
January 4, 2010, 6:39 pm
2609 E. Encinas
Gilbert, Arizona 85234

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This cause the cost to maintain the system to rise and be passed on to the consumer making harder for low income families to pay for it without government help. I pay enough taxes and do not need to pay for others to use the internet. Also this will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jeanette Coufal
January 4, 2010, 6:39 pm
6919 Morningside
Sugar Land, Texas 77479

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

PLEASE VOTE AMERICAN NOT DEMOCRAT OR REPUBLIC. STAND UP FOR US THE PEOPLE FOR A CHANGE.

Pat Coulson
January 4, 2010, 6:40 pm
1815 Castle Oaks Drive
Pearland, Texas 77581

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Government has no constitutional duty or authority to regulate the internet under the Commerce Clause as to do so would cause a chilling effect on the open exchange of citizens who have the right to freedom of speech, freedom of expression and freedom of electronic assembly. Butt out!

James Coulston
January 4, 2010, 6:40 pm
3537 Granada Ave.
San Diego, California 92104

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Additionally, it is only Marxist who want this foolishness to happen. There is really no reason for it except to stop the free flow of information and a pure bigotry of the Leftist in control of this country right now. It is those who hate true Liberty that are behind this. The enemies of Liberty must be stopped. They will claim “net neutrality” is something to make things equal, but that is a lie. Do not be fooled by the deceivers, the enemies of Liberty.

The enemies of Liberty do not want this to go through an open debate in Congress because they know the public will have a lot of input against their control schemes.

The simple fact is the internet works now. There are no complaints and we do not want to be monitored by the State, nor have the State in control of the very means of communication I am sending this objection. I work in the IT field and I know for a fact government will only make things worse in this area. You need specifics, let me know!

Ferne Covington
January 4, 2010, 6:40 pm
20167 Harbour Ridge
Smithfield, Virginia 23430

As an Americans for Prosperity, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Wade Cowart
January 4, 2010, 6:41 pm
6397 Miramonte Dr.
#102
Orlando, Florida 32835

As an Americans for Prosperity supporter, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Douglas Cox
January 4, 2010, 6:42 pm
27250 Grobbel
Warren, Michigan 48092

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Tone Cox
January 4, 2010, 6:42 pm
1605 Bunker Hill Dr.
Sun City Center, Florida 33573

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I am not alone in this effort. I am sure millions of Americans have the same concerns about government growing out of control.

Thank you

Colin Coxall
January 4, 2010, 6:43 pm
420 Roberson Creek Road
Pittsboro, North Carolina 27312

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This Administration and its "operatives" are becoming increasingly arrogant in what they think they have a right to do. We, the voters and citizens, elect Congress to represent us. We do not elect members of any Commission. I have no objection to Commissions or Czars, or whatever you like to call them, provided they act as ADVISORS, and do not have any authority to make changes to the laws of this Country. That responsibility lies with the LEGISLATURE and you cannot off-load that responsibility to any other. You and you alone should debate and formulate laws and changes to those laws as our representatives. Any other action is an abdication of your responsibilities, and is unconstitutional. Do not forget that you took an oath of office to uphold the Constitution.

John Cox
January 4, 2010, 6:43 pm
308 Berclair Ave.
River Ridge, Louisiana 70123

I do NOT want a Federal takeover of the Internet. The "Mainstream Media" is now defacto controlled by the Federal Government. Cable News, Talk Radio and Internet are the only communications not acting as defacto Propaganda Arms of the Federal Government.

NO MORE BIG MOTHER. Mind your own business. Leave us alone. Leave the Internet alone.

James Coyle
January 4, 2010, 6:44 pm
2827 Redland Trail
San Antonio, Texas 78259

As a concerned American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jeniene Marie Crain
January 4, 2010, 6:45 pm
8 Vitoria Lane
Hot Springs Village, Arkansas 71909

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We are tired of every aspect of government attempting to take over and control our lives. Opposing excessive taxation and government control is exactly how this country came to fruition and existence. The government entities are no longer representing the people they are attempting to dictate and rule the people. No we are not stupid and we will oppose those who continue to take away our freedoms. We have military that are currently fighting for freedoms in foreign countries. The citizens of this United States, who are not in the military, will continue to fight for our freedoms here at home.

Renee Crandall
January 4, 2010, 6:46 pm
4967 NE Townline Rd
Marcellus
Marcellus, New York 13108

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.
I agree totally with this statement.

Nathan Crapo
January 4, 2010, 6:46 pm
9303 Gilcrease #1052
Las Vegas, Nevada 89149

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Our lawmakers are not listening to "we the poeople" that they represent. Stop listening to special interest groups and radical marxist groups that seek to take power from us the people... YES I SAID MARXIST, RADICAL, COMMUNISTS THAT YOU ARE!!!! WE DONT WANT YOUR CRAPPY POLICIES! LEAVE US ALONE AND STOP TAKING OUR FREEDOMS!

Larry Creef
January 4, 2010, 6:46 pm
1522 Carrolton Way
Chesapeake, Virginia 23320-3093

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank You,

Larry W. Creef

Cedra Crenshaw
January 4, 2010, 6:46 pm
616 Keystone Drive
Bolingbrook, Illinois 60440

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

"Net neutrality" is more than an obvious attempt to further infringe upon individual liberty.

Edna Earle and Raiford Crews
January 4, 2010, 6:46 pm
2987 Crews Lane
Crystal Springs, Mississippi 39059

As Americans for Prosperity activist, we are submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

We are especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

CK Crist
January 4, 2010, 6:47 pm
5400 S Park Terrace 7-202
Greenwood Village, Colorado 80111

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Eric Crittenden
January 4, 2010, 6:47 pm
319 Dogwood Dr.
Tahlequah, Oklahoma 74464

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I also feel that the current administration is going above and beyond those powers granted to the Federal Government via the U.S. Constitution. No where in the U.S. Constitution is the Federal Government given the power to ingratiate itself into a market as a competitor in the free enterprise arena. By doing so, our tax dollars will be spent to put thousands of people out of work and cause an already fragile economy to implode in on itself.

The BIG federal government needs to go back to the original intended size and steer clear of any competitive arenas.

Jennifer Crone
January 4, 2010, 6:47 pm
4041 Montrose Court
Orlando, Florida 32812

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

William Crooks
January 4, 2010, 6:47 pm
808 Laurel Cove
Buda, Texas 78610

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ralph Cross
January 4, 2010, 6:48 pm
103 Foxworth Court
Dothan, Alabama 36305

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Our internet has had an extremely explosive period of growth since it's genesis, and that is precisely because the government was NOT involved! The government has nothing to offer in the future growth and success of the internet but assured failure ... for the people. Government interference into the operation and governance of our internet is not desired and is positively not wanted!

Keep the governments' hands off our free internet. Otherwise it will not be free for long, and will be available only to whomever the government finds "adaptable" to their terms. Have I made it clear that I do not desire government interference on or in our internet?

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Lee and Joan Croston
January 4, 2010, 6:48 pm
14138 W Hwy 266
Bois D'Arc, Nebraska 65612

As Americans for Prosperity activists, we are submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

We are especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This is nothing more than an attempt to further control our lives - what material can be disseminated, what we can read/learn, what we can share. The government is seeking to allow only their own point of view as they are already doing in the major media. Now they want to control the information flow on the internet. This is nothing more than a totalitarian move as was used by Hitler and Chavez. Have we come to the horrors of that? This has nothing to do with fairness and will result in totally lopsided information from the Far Left and Socialists. This cannot be allowed. We are not Venezuela, Cuba, China, or North Korea and MUST NOT let this administration have ANY power or means that can turn America into anything like these horrendous governments.

john crowe
January 4, 2010, 6:48 pm
401 sutter gate lane
morrisville, North Carolina 27560

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, and an intense supporter and believer in capitalism, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win both commercial and residential customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. Currently, if a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers as they would most certainly move to a competitor they felt better suited their internet needs. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn as it would no longer be a truly free, open and competitive market responsive to users needs as a whole.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably, and irrevocably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank you,
John Crowe

michael cuba
January 4, 2010, 6:49 pm
633 ashberry lane
altamonte springs, Florida 32714

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Competition is what drives this country and requires companies to be more efficient. This is not a matter of debate, but fact. Why would anyone impose regulations to make it more difficult on companies? The internet has grown leaps and bounds over it's life time precisely because the government was not involved. To ignore that fact means you are buying into the hysteria being shouted out by committed socialists trying to have more Government control. Which would be fine if the government was efficient, trustworthy, and infallible. But as it is not any of these 3 things we must prevent it from controlling any of the internet

Mary Culver
January 4, 2010, 6:49 pm
13890 Dawson Street
Garden Grove, California 92843

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

This proposed bill concerns me greatly because of our vital freedom of speech. I am especially concerned that the Commission is contemplating "Internet content restrictions," such as tat suggested under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

PLEASE DON'T EVEN CONSIDER THIS BILL - IF IT COMES UP FOR A VOTE, D E F E A T IT!

Thank you,
Mary J. Culver
Garden Grove, CA

James Cummings
January 4, 2010, 6:50 pm
1S200 Cantigny Drive
Winfield, Illinois 60190

Leave the internet alone.

Keep the government out of what has been (without government regulation) one of the most successful accomplishments of the last century.

The FCC should be focusing on opening up more bandwidth so that the Internet can continue to expand.

J. Cummings
Winfield, IL

Diane Curley
January 4, 2010, 6:50 pm
652 Allen Run Rd
Sistersville, West Virginia 26175

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Most Rev. Leonard Curreri
January 4, 2010, 6:50 pm
1740 West 7th Street
Brooklyn
New York, New York 11223

As a Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sharon Curry
January 4, 2010, 6:50 pm
9207 Lanshire Dr
Dallas, Texas 75238

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I love America for the capitalist, free-enterprise economic system it offers all citizens. I vehemently oppose the very concept of the left and Obama's agenda to "fundamentally change America". This is truly anti-American. Our constitutional framers would shudder to hear this "net neutrality" assault to our freedom of speech and assembly through government controls.

Thomas Curry
January 4, 2010, 6:51 pm
12300 Casa Grande Ave. NE
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87112

As an American citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The proposed burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Amy Curtis
January 4, 2010, 6:51 pm
1914 Kentucky
Lawrence, Kansas 66046

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I am 100% AGAINST ANY regulation or government policing of the Internet. Allow the Internet to be a truly free medium of expression by leaving it alone.

Thank you.

Mary Dadian
January 4, 2010, 6:52 pm
8255 Wrightwood Ave
River Grove, Illinois 60171

As an Americans for Prosperity activist and a computer professional since 1973, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The government needs to stay out of the free market place. This is an perfect example of the people (government) starting an endeavor to share resources that the free market has now made the most of.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Rosalie Dahlvang
January 4, 2010, 6:52 pm
11104 E 9th Ave
Spokane Valley, Washington 99206

As an Americans for Prosperity member, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

John Dalke
January 4, 2010, 6:52 pm
21018 84th Ave W
Edmonds, Washington 98026

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This administration is trying to strangle Americans and the freedom guaranteed under The Constitution of The United States and must be stopped. There are three branches of government but it appears the current administration wants ONE. The FCC is not authorized and should not be authorized to interfere with internet access.

Kelly Darden
January 4, 2010, 6:53 pm
6875 Prairienook
Roscoe, Illinois 61073

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Please leave our internet and our cable alone. Leave the government out of the cable/internet business. Our families are being taxed enough. We do not need anymore interference of our lives.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Timothy Darsow
January 4, 2010, 6:56 pm
5C Golden Oaks Drive
Circle Pines, Minnesota 55014

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52: KEEP OUT OF MY LIFE!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Cindy Daubenspeck
January 4, 2010, 6:56 pm
225 Lakewood Drive
Carrollton, Georgia 30117

The internet is not the business of the government and you work for us, so it is your job to listen and follow our requests in regard to the following:

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Gabriel Dauphin
January 4, 2010, 6:56 pm
3118 Appleton Ave
Parsons, Kansas 67357

As a voting citizen of the United States of America, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Yours sincerely,

Gabriel Dauphin

Chester Davis
January 4, 2010, 6:57 pm
2241 NW 50 st
Lincoln, Nebraska 68524

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive and is a solid example of free market principles. Private companies and software which block specified Internet traffic are available for those concerned about content.

The FCC is not the appropriate place in determining if and what government control should be exercised over the Internet. The internet is not a public utility nor should it become one. As far as I can tell doing so would be extremely questionable when weighed against the constitution. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. This type of regulation should only come through branches of the government which are appropriately accountable to the citizens such as the congress or senate, not through unelected government employees.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations on the internet.

Sincerely,
Chester Davis

John Davis
January 4, 2010, 6:57 pm
6121se 45th st
Tecumseh, Kansas 665429540

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense. We don't need more Gov intrusion in our lives.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Norman Davis
January 4, 2010, 6:58 pm
210 Telford Rd
Telford, Tennessee 37690

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Why is there this insistence to control our freedoms?

Paula Davis
January 4, 2010, 6:59 pm
120 Richard Rd
Corrales, New Mexico 87048

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Denise Davison
January 4, 2010, 6:59 pm
6 Misty Creek Lane
Laguna Hills, California 92653

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely, Denise Davison

Victoria Davisson
January 4, 2010, 6:59 pm
29884 Trimmer Springs Road
Space 14
Sanger, California 93657

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Joan Day
January 4, 2010, 7:00 pm
1942 Dan Drive
Layton, Utah 84040

As an Americans for Prosperity member, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

John Day
January 4, 2010, 7:00 pm
377 Amber Lane
Bonners Ferry, Idaho 83805

The internet is the only source of news I have access to on a daily basis. I can't even receive a radio station broadcast where I live. The freedom of information available on the internet applies to everyone. Set aside politics and get out of the way of our free exercise of the first amendment. The proposed bill will stifle free speech.

Willa Day
January 4, 2010, 7:00 pm
Two 14th Street
Apt 202
Hoboken, New Jersey 7030

I support Net Neutrality and hope the FCC passes a strong rule that keeps control over the Internet in the hands of users and not ISPs.

Net Neutrality is a rule that conservatives should embrace. It protects our fundamental right to control our media experience without interference by gatekeepers. Such user-powered control is a bedrock principal of the conservative movement.

Organizations like Americans for Prosperity have betrayed their conservative roots in favor of a paycheck from special corporate interests to lobby against Net Neutrality.

The FCC should act in favor of all Internet users, regardless of their politics, and protect Net Neutrality.

IRoger De Haan
January 4, 2010, 7:01 pm
105 Police Club Drive
Kings Mountain, North Carolina 28086

As an Americans who believes the Constitution guarantees FREEDOM OF SPEECH, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Government control of competition is unethical and unconstitutional. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. This is one way to DESTROY SMALL BUSINESS. Small business provides 80% of our jobs. TO DESTROY SMALL BUSINESS IS TO DESTROY AMERICA.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney. THIS IS A POLICY WHICH MUST BE REVERSED.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. FREEDOM OF ENTERPRISE IS OUR BEST BET FOR A STRONG AND PROSPEROUS AMERICA.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Denis De Staic
January 4, 2010, 7:01 pm
28 West clear lake lane
Westfield, Indiana 46074

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

STOP Keep your Greasy PAWS off The INTERNET and while ye are Listening Keep your Claws Off Everything Else and let the TRUE "FREE" From GOVERNMENT MARKET do its thing and we will be fine. BRING ON NOVEMBER BYE BYE BAMA

Ward De Witt
January 4, 2010, 7:02 pm
135 Penland Way
Missoula, Montana 59803

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The free expression of ideas over the Internet is one of the remaining avenues that allows individuals a chance to communicate with others about their ideas, hopes, and dreams. A free society needs this option. What we don't need is more governmental restriction on our freedom.

Brad Dean
January 4, 2010, 7:02 pm
6618 Winder Oaks Blvd
Orlando, Florida 32819

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Read our constitution and keep your oath to protect it. If you want socialism, move to Venezuela.

Marcia DeBoer
January 4, 2010, 7:03 pm
2200 Easy St.
Wyoming, Michigan 49519

Regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

John DeBrular
January 4, 2010, 7:05 pm
94 Grafton St
Washington, West Virginia 26181

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I do not want the government to be involved in this matter in any manner. It works for us - leave it alone.

Grace DeCicco
January 4, 2010, 7:05 pm
129 Duane St
Farmingdale, New York 11735

Hands off the internet. Period!

John Decker
January 4, 2010, 7:06 pm
2713 e.21st st
tucson, Arizona 85716

As a member of Americans for Prosperity, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that would legally have to be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected, yet not very bright, legislative branch of government. The Commission should never on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be completely ignored. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for attempting to impose new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. In short, stay out of the Internet, you have caused enough trouble already.

Robert Deean
January 4, 2010, 7:07 pm
29 Dings Hollow Rd
Whitney Point, New York 13862

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

John Deen
January 4, 2010, 7:08 pm
331 Balsa St.
Henderson, Nevada 89002-8232

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Government should let competition among companies continue and not interfere.

Thanks,
John Deen

John deGroot
January 4, 2010, 7:09 pm
9301 Avondale Road
Apt s-2105
Redmond, Washington 98052

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming a viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is no rationale for imposing new regulations that will have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Roger DeHaan
January 4, 2010, 7:09 pm
408 S. Walnut St.
Townsend, Montana 2910

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We are in great need of less government not more. The American taxpayer is overburdened with taxes now.

carl dehaven
January 4, 2010, 7:09 pm
3624 Murray Hollow Rd.
Thaxton, Virginia 24174

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Nicholas Del Giudice
January 4, 2010, 7:09 pm
6 Copperfield Ct.
Port Monmouth, New Jersey 7758

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Government control of the internet is nothing more than the Liberal Left dictatorial control of free speech. The criminal Government wants to silence the dissemination of its evil, un-American activities.

Christopher Delaney, MD
January 4, 2010, 7:10 pm
2425 Tram Road
New Bern, North Carolina 28562

I want the government to stay out of regulating the internet. The government is corrupt and incompetent, for the most part, and their regulating this free form of communication and information sharing can only result in a loss of my freedom. Stay out.

Shirley Deley
January 4, 2010, 7:11 pm
2379 Oak Trace St.
Youngstown, Ohio 44515

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sam DeLong
January 4, 2010, 7:11 pm
P. O. Box 4691
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23454

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Leave my internet and free speech alone!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

BILL DELONY
January 4, 2010, 7:11 pm
10000 SW 186TH AVE
DUNNELLON, Florida 34432

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Kathleen DeMill
January 4, 2010, 7:13 pm
1294 Veronica Ct.
Carlsbad, California 92011

As an American citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Francis Demko
January 4, 2010, 7:13 pm
215 valley View Road
Ruckersville, Virginia 22968

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

FMD

Frank Demko
January 4, 2010, 7:13 pm
215 Valley View Rd
Ruckersville, Virginia 22968

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Get Government out of the way. Let the free enterprise system work.

SHERYL DENBOW
January 4, 2010, 7:14 pm
3480 S PEEBLY RD
CHOCTAW, Oklahoma 73020

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney. As we all know anything government run doesn't work & eventually goes broke.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Erol Denizkurt
January 4, 2010, 7:14 pm
4548 Andover Way F303
Naples, Florida 34112

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

STOP CREATING LEGISLATION THAT LIMITS THE INTERNET AND GIVES THE GOVERNMENT POWER. THE INTERNET IS OPEN FOR THE PEOPLE TO USE AND COMMUNITE WITH EACH OTHER.

Robert Derber
January 4, 2010, 7:14 pm
2923 Kipling Ct
Springfield, Illinois 62711

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Freedom and open marketplace are all that is needed to keep the internet open. We do not need more government controls on our lives. The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jon DeRosier
January 4, 2010, 7:14 pm
5531 Emerson Ave N
Brooklyn Center, Minnesota 55430

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Let private industry innovate, the government governs and that's it.

Patricia DesMarais
January 4, 2010, 7:15 pm
1381 Country Club Dr
Hampstead, North Carolina 28443

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Donna Detwiler
January 4, 2010, 7:16 pm
18775 Ambrose Lane
Huntington Beach, California 92648

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Donna Detwiler

Benjamin Devey
January 4, 2010, 7:17 pm
1022 West 220 South
Orem, Utah 84058

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I oppose unconstitutional measures restricting freedom of speech.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

EDSEL DEVILLE
January 4, 2010, 7:17 pm
522 Acadian Way
Myrtle Beach, South Carolina 29588

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.
In short KEEP THE FCC OUT OF THE INTERNET.

Sharon Devin
January 4, 2010, 7:17 pm
P O Box 630
Taylor, Arizona 85939

Comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

This is obviously an attempt to regulate the internet and free speech. I oppose the so-called "open internet". Stay out of the internet.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Alan Dewey
January 4, 2010, 7:17 pm
603 Ragsdale Rd
Jamestown, North Carolina 27282

As an Americans for Prosperity proponent, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Billie Dewhirst
January 4, 2010, 7:17 pm
2404 Diamond Place
Clarksville, Indiana 47129

On preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Leave it alone.

Open internet or net neutrality are just terms for tyranny, coercion and control of communications.

Hands off!

Scott DiBert
January 4, 2010, 7:18 pm
5922 San Reno Drive
Sylvania, Ohio 43560

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Andrea DiDonato
January 4, 2010, 7:19 pm
2924 SE 6th Ave
Cape Coral, Florida 33904

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The internet has become a powerful communications and economic force because it has been free from government interference. To ensure that the power and promise of the internet continues, we need to protect it as both a free marketplace of commerce and of ideas. UNLESS there are covert reasons for the gov't's involvement with the Internet, this idea should be trashed. Leave well-enough alone. Thanks you.

Emily Diefenbaugh
January 4, 2010, 7:20 pm
6579 Manna Ave
Cashton, Wisconsin 54619

Government IS the PROBLEM.....NOT the ANSWER....STAY OUT OF PRIVATE INDUSTRY!!!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dallas Dill
January 4, 2010, 7:20 pm
209A N Ridgeway Dr
916 Highland
Cleburne, Texas 76033

As a concerned citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mary Dillon
January 4, 2010, 7:20 pm
5870 Coleman Rd.
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.in other words.....
WHAT--ARE WE LIVING IN IRAN NOW!!!!

Nanette Dion
January 4, 2010, 7:21 pm
3500 Oakgate Drive
San Antonio, Texas 78230

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

I do not believe that the government should have any controls over the internet. As parents we can control it ourselves for our children. This is not IRAN and I don't care what you call it, no US government should get involved or try to control the internet.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Nanette Dion

Charlie Dismore
January 4, 2010, 7:21 pm
10018 Estancia Lane
Austin, Texas 78739

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We do not want more government control over private enterprise, but less. Far less. We would appreciate it if you would get your priorities straight and get out of our business.

Charlie Dismore

Larry Dittler
January 4, 2010, 7:21 pm
3011 N. Dakota St.
Chandler, Arizona 85225

As an American for protecting Freedom of Speech, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please protect our Constitutional Rights, ALL of them!

Sincerely,

Richard Ditmer
January 4, 2010, 7:22 pm
704 Attica St.
Vandalia, Ohio 45377

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.
Keep your "NOSE" out of our "AFFAIR"

Geri Dixon
January 4, 2010, 7:23 pm
30002 Saw Oaks Drive
Magnolia, Texas 77355

WHY ALL OF A SUDDEN DOES THE GOVERNMENT HAVE TO BE IN EVERYTHING, IF IT TOOK CARE OF WHAT IT SHOULD BE THEY WOULDN'T HAVE TIME FOR OTHER AVENUES THAT THEY DON'T NEED TO BE IN. GOV. IS NOT DOING A VERY GOOD JOB WITH WHAT THEY HAVE. LEAVE THE REST ALONE. TAKE CARE OF THE PEOPLE! WHAT A CONCEPT.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mike Dodd
January 4, 2010, 7:23 pm
15176 Rockford Rd.
Montpelier, Virginia 23192

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "telephone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If the government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that are economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or need to be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately-elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply NO rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jean Dohanyos
January 4, 2010, 7:23 pm
828 Edgewood Drive
Royal Oak, Michigan 48067

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I ADAMANTLY OPPOSE ACTIONS THAT WILL RESULT IN THE SUPPRESSION OF THIS MEDIUM OF FREE SPEECH. PLEASE REJECT THE CONCEPT OF "NET NETRALITY" ENTIRELY.

Terry Doherty
January 4, 2010, 7:23 pm
12521 Muscovy Drive
Jacksonville, Florida 32223

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Just say "No!" to any proposed regulation. You have stayed out of the way of innovation and competition with GREAT SUCCESS. Why spoil such a track record of wisdom now!

Greg Donahoe
January 4, 2010, 7:24 pm
25760 Thomas
Warren, Michigan 48091

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers.

The fact is that ISP's need the flexibility to prioritize traffic because, frankly, not all traffic is created equal. Having to reserve bandwidth for, say, an individual's personal site covering 20 year old footwear to the detriment of sites more in demand helps no one (except maybe the footwear site owner) and inhibits commerce.

The market will punish ISP's that aren't fair to their subscribers. This so called "net neutrality" policing by the FCC is not needed and would serve only to create additional costs with zero benefit.

Leon E. Donahue
January 4, 2010, 7:24 pm
2338 N Fremont
Tacoma, Washington 98406-1613

As an Freedom loving American and Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James Dorn
January 4, 2010, 7:24 pm
32 Wood Ave
Englishtown, New Jersey 7726

I completely agree with the following.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

regis doucette
January 4, 2010, 7:25 pm
po 82
hillsdale, New Jersey 7642

As a thinking person who worked in the telecommunications industry, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please keep your hands off this important communication effort. Look at what your ineptness has done with other interference where stated goals are redefined after the failures and where the exact opposite swings back against stated goals.

Theresa Dougherty
January 4, 2010, 7:25 pm
212 Blackstrap Rd
Falmouth, Maine 4105

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

John Douglas
January 4, 2010, 7:25 pm
412 East Scenic Drive
The Dalles, Oregon 97058

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

I depend on the internet business model to supplement my retirement income, if the net becomes another government monopoly my business will fail, as I do not have the "deep pockets" that all public utilities have. I believe I will be regulated out of business. DO NOT PASS THIS BILL, IT STINKS OF CORRUPTION AND MORE GOVERNMENT BAILOUTS.....

DO NOT PASS THIS LEGISLATION!!!/John Douglas

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Campbell Douglass
January 4, 2010, 7:27 pm
turtletracks@cfl.rr.com
New Smyrna, Florida 32169

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Robert Dove
January 4, 2010, 7:27 pm
56 Old Vineyard Ln
Flint Hill, Virginia 22627

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Stop the government takeover and over regulation of the Internet.

Respectfully,

Robert Scott Dove

Jo Dowdy
January 4, 2010, 7:27 pm
5443 outer drive
Aurora, Indiana 47001

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely
Jo

Tom Downs
January 4, 2010, 7:28 pm
PO Box 840597
Houston, Texas 77284-0597

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. But a government agency exercising control over the Internet would leave no other place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Brian Dozois
January 4, 2010, 7:28 pm
93 Squashville Rd.
Greenfield, New York 12833

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Government control makes it worst, look at everything they touch.

Michael Drabyk
January 4, 2010, 7:28 pm
3145 Rushland Rd
Jamison, Pennsylvania 18929

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney and especially Barrack Obama, the communist, who pledged not to "take a backseat to anyone" regarding control of the internet.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Rene Drake
January 4, 2010, 7:28 pm
21122 22nd Avenue West
Brier, Washington 98026

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Larry Drew
January 4, 2010, 7:30 pm
14305 Briarthorn Dr
Tampa, Florida 33625

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Do not allow the pseudo-patriots of the fascist left to silence the only remaining freedom of speech we have... the only means we have of stopping this seizure of our rights, freedom and sovereignty.

RONALD DSOUZA
January 4, 2010, 7:30 pm
16DAVID RD
SOMERS, New York 10589

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense. AS SUCH AN AVENUE OF FREE SPEECH DISSAPPEARS.

The Internet would either be crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, and would inevitably bring about government control/ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ron Dudas Sr
January 4, 2010, 7:31 pm
9234 E Diamond Dr
Sun Lakes, Arizona 85248

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dana Duke
January 4, 2010, 7:31 pm
1847 Edgewood Rd.
Baltimore, Maryland 21234

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely, Dana Duke

John Duley
January 4, 2010, 7:31 pm
762 N Clinton St.
Orange, California 92867

Although the following is a pre-written comment, I have read it in its entirety and approve of and agree with the total content.
John P. Duley

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Wesley Duncan
January 4, 2010, 7:32 pm
188 Casey Drive
Traphill, North Carolina 28685

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

It is not the government's place to “run” everything on the planet. Try your power grab somewhere else where the people don't know what you're doing!

Jim Dundon
January 4, 2010, 7:32 pm
N11W28910 Northview rd.
Waukesha, Wisconsin 53188

Why can't the power grab stop and let us try to save our country, before it is too late. We can't afford more government. We need private enterprise.

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Look to the mess you have created in the patent office and leave the internet alone.

Jim Dundon

Janelle Dundore
January 4, 2010, 7:32 pm
5076 Ladera Dr.
Camarillo, California 93012

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We are supposed to be a free country not a dictatorship.

Janelle Dundore
January 4, 2010, 7:32 pm
5076 Ladera Dr.
Camarillo, California 93012

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We are supposed to be a free country not a dictatorship.

Denny Dunlap
January 4, 2010, 7:33 pm
3010 Cameron St.
Indianapolis, Indiana 46203

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jennifer Dunn
January 4, 2010, 7:34 pm
9581 W. Old Mill Dr.
Boise, Idaho 83709

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

p.s. Please don't use my tax dollars to implement yet more regulations that will stifle the free market, and my own freedom of speech.

Linda Dunn
January 4, 2010, 7:34 pm
26 Old Bethel Road
Newtown, Connecticut 06470

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mary Ann Dunn
January 4, 2010, 7:36 pm
P.O. Box 1927
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

As one of many who pay your salary, I request that you drop proceedings for, or vote against this proposal. You, as a representative of ours must see that the Freedoms our Country was founded with remain free!!

The Internet should not be put into Government hands or control. There is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,
Mary Ann Dunn

Robert Dunn
January 4, 2010, 7:36 pm
300 Steamboat Rd.
Kings Point, New York 11024

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Don't do it.

Diana Dunsmore
January 4, 2010, 7:36 pm
85 Dorris Rd.
Milton, Georgia 30004

As a concerned citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

A transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Judith Durdan
January 4, 2010, 7:37 pm
641 Turnberry Court
TArpon Springs, Florida 34688

We need less WASHINGTON involvement not more and we need less government not more.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Kent and Janis Durfee
January 4, 2010, 7:37 pm
PO Box 175
Almo, Idaho 83312

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

We do NOT agree with the open Internet policies. This seems to be a ploy to allow the government to become involved in its regulation. This seems to set the stage for government to be able to control the content and use of the Internet. It seems a small step to shut down communication and information from sources not approved by the people in charge.

Such actions should be discussed in the open by Congress, not put into force under hard to understand rules by a regulatory agency.

Please do not continue on this course of action.

Pamela Durre
January 4, 2010, 7:37 pm
300 North 8th Street
Hiawatha, Kansas 66434

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Lillian Duval
January 4, 2010, 7:38 pm
21891 Big Bend Rd.
Montgomery Creek, California 96065

I am opposed to "Open Internet" rules! We do not want Government controlling the Internet.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James Dyer
January 4, 2010, 7:39 pm
3164 Westminster Ct
Shasta Lake, California 96019

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

dyyirl dyyirl

January 4, 2010, 7:40 pm

hnixob@wlupse.com

hnixob@wlupse.com

hyVKEdtlr, West Virginia GcwPBViHzvfiHTgdIzc

XCrtPD omnvwcyjipuf, [url=http://qtqbucblzvfa.com/]qtqbucblzvfa[/url],
[link=http://sjckihhmuvjw.com/]sjckihhmuvjw[/link], http://vztdwhjkyfn.com/

Alan Eames
January 4, 2010, 7:40 pm
12610 Keswick Stl
No. Hollywood, California 91605

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

For the life of me, I can't figure out why anyone thinks the Internet needs to be regulated. For the first time in a very long time, "we the people" have a communications medium that is not controlled by special interests. For the first time in a very long time, "we the people" have a way to help preserve our 1st amendment rights to speak and to peaceably assemble.

Keep the government out of the internet. #1 - where is the Constitutional authority for the FCC to make up laws. I understand that Congress has been ceding its authority to the Executive Branch for a long time, but this still does not make it Constitutional. #2 - preserving the internet requires no regulation. It is functioning just fine as a method for people to communicate.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

Government granted monopolies were the whole reason that cable companies went through massive consolidation and we ended with very little (basically none) until DirecTV came along - and it certainly wasn't government regulation that enable DirecTV to take a huge bite out of cable system revenues.

The free market works, please allow it to. Stay out of the Internet.

Taylor Earl
January 4, 2010, 7:41 pm
3275 S. Sepulveda Blvd, #201
Los Angeles, California 90034

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I oppose it for many reasons. But first and foremost is that it is an necessary role for the federal government. There has to be a limit on how far the government will go.

Robin Eason
January 4, 2010, 7:43 pm
2705 Deer Park Rd.
Finksburg, Maryland 21048

As a thinking person, I know that: Absolute Power Corrupts Absolutely!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Michael Eberhardt
January 4, 2010, 7:44 pm
138 Lost Horse Lane
Hendersonville, North Carolina 28739

Government control of the internet would inevitably result in POLITICAL INFLUENCE & BIAS.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former Obama White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Richard Edes
January 4, 2010, 7:44 pm
PO Box 578
Sequim, Washington 98382

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We don't need any Socialist Government Political hack telling us what to do!

Rodger Edgar
January 4, 2010, 7:44 pm
P. O. Box 83854
Phoenix, Arizona 85071

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If any government tried to exercise control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Brandon Edwards
January 4, 2010, 7:45 pm
921 NE 10th Street
East Wenatchee, Washington 98802

As an American, I am submitting my objection and request regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

This is clearly overstepping the objectives of our Government! Protecting the people is protecting our liberty and freedom!!!

If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers(ie: a "FREE MARKET" value). If government exercised control over the Internet, it would result in First Amendment arguments and likely abuses that would result in many such violations of our constitutionally protected rights. This will impose uncertainty and create significant litigation challenges and expenses.

The Internet is highly competitive currently. The burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that are more likely economically efficient. Government restrictions such as these reduce the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

All that would be yet another un-welcome government intrusion into the private free enterprise market!!! Equal to un-American practices, un-constitutional, non-supporting of individual liberty and the rights protecting our values and principles that do support a free-market, not interfered with or limited by it's elected government.

Are you going to continue to be moving toward a totalitarian - fascist government or self-correct??? Returning to the Republic-Democracy that represents the people of a free-market, pursuant to living with liberty, justice, and happiness!!!

Lee Edwards
January 4, 2010, 7:45 pm
908 Meadowlands Dr
Winston Salem, North Carolina 27107

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE, NO GOVT INTERFERENCE MORONS !!!!

Paul Edwards
January 4, 2010, 7:45 pm
1170 Three Mile Creek Road
Stevensville, Montana 5987--6145

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We do not any more Un-accountable Burauocrats interfering with our usage of the Inter-Net!

William D. Edwards
January 4, 2010, 7:45 pm
2013 Antares Dr
Bastrop, Louisiana 71220

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This a prefab piece of correspondence, but I agree with it and am opposed to any level of government getting into the control of any form of free speech. Not in ownership nor content nor control of facilities.

J. Eells
January 4, 2010, 7:46 pm
2260 Roundtop Dr
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80918

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

A transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Stop a Washington takeover of the Internet!!!

Stephen Egan
January 4, 2010, 7:46 pm
13909 E Rockwell
Spokane Valley, Washington 99216

As an American citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. Government oversight is not neutral in its regulatory effect.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sandra Eggers
January 4, 2010, 7:46 pm
11344 Sioux
Redford, Michigan 48239

As an Americans for Prosperity activist -- and as a person for whom the Internet is essential to providing my living -- I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

David & Lori Eick
January 4, 2010, 7:48 pm
2120 Hercules Dr.
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80906

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Leave the internet as it is. It is working well for most Americans, so why fix what isn't broken.

Marie Eier
January 4, 2010, 7:50 pm
1403 15th Avenue
Lewiston, Idaho 83501

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Wherefore I believe if inacted it would also be a breach of free speech.

george a eifler
January 4, 2010, 7:51 pm
4109 e. st. joseph way
phoenix, Arizona 85108

As an intensive user of the internet developed by free people for free people to provide them free access to the total information from around the world. It was NEVER intended nor designed to be controlled or regulated by Government in a free society. Now in a DICTORIAL form of government it may be envisioned since those people do not have FREEDOM. If the US government takes control, regulation or any other action regarding use or content of the internet then we are the same as North Korea, China, Iran. For sure this is not what FREE SOCIETIES DO!

It has been proven that the Internet has allowed for the creation of millions of jobs. Under government regulation, control or administartion this activity will be GREATLY REDUCED.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Harry Eitel
January 4, 2010, 7:52 pm
14019 Soper St.
Cedar Lake, Indiana 46303

This is not China We have freedoms keep your lying theiving hands out of the internet.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Margaret Ellefson
January 4, 2010, 7:53 pm
1801 Baneberry Ct.
Wausau, Wisconsin 54401

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am interested in preserving the individual freedoms of American taxpayers. A Washington takeover of the internet would further strip the American people of our liberties and I ask that this not be allowed to happen.

Thank you.

Alison Elley
January 4, 2010, 7:55 pm
7606 NW 69th Terrace
Kansas City, Missouri 64152

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE. WE DON'T NEED THE GOVT'S HELP SCREWING THIS UP TOO.

Herndon Elliott
January 4, 2010, 7:55 pm
142 Kensington Drive
Madison, Alabama 35758

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The federal government regulatory efforts result in debilitating restrictions and limitations in nearly every regulatory area, and the heavily regulated areas of business are struggling to compete with the rest of the world. The Internet has put America on top of the world from a business and economic standpoint. Having the FCC start regulating routing policy is a recipe for destroying America's dominance of the Internet.

The FCC should stick to issues of ethical business practices related to consumers and stay completely out of the technology except in cases where competition is being undermined. Competition and capitalism are what has made America great.

I am a professional Computer Engineer. I have a master's degree in Computer Science from the University of Alabama. I also am a Certified Information Systems Security Professional (CISSP). I make my living working to protect a large enterprise network of nearly 6000 users. I live in the world of the Internet every day.

The FCC needs to stay out of this realm, and the US Federal Government needs to stop with this disgusting socialist anti-American agenda. Our Founding Fathers and framers of the US Constitution would be sickened by the "change" that our current regime is proposing and pressing forward.

Steven Elliott
January 4, 2010, 7:55 pm
120 Valley Springs Road
Columbia, South Carolina 29223

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In other words, I want the government to stop intruding into my life and the life of business with your socialist control. We don't need you and your regulations.

Donald Ellis
January 4, 2010, 7:57 pm
39 Donald Drive
Orinda, California 94563

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Kevin Ellis
January 4, 2010, 7:57 pm
18200 Ohio Court
Orland Park, Illinois 60467

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I disapprove of the government taking over the internet.

Lisa Ellison
January 4, 2010, 7:57 pm
126 Streamview Dr.
Cary, North Carolina 27519

Keep your hands off the internet. Keep your hands off my healthcare. Keep you hands out of my pocketbook. You have done enough damage to our freedom and liberty so take a vacation and go home.

Lisa Ellison

MARION ELLISON
January 4, 2010, 7:58 pm
PO BOX 548
MINDEN, Nevada 89423

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. I want the government to stay out of my life--and my internet!

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

Beware! The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be eliminated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Why more lies?? Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Willard Elsberry
January 4, 2010, 7:59 pm
4733 Burgundy Place
Lakeland, Florida 33813

As an Americans for Prosperity activist symnpathizer, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mark Engbring
January 4, 2010, 7:59 pm
730 Center St.
Black Earth, Wisconsin 53515

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The internet is current fine AS IS a free and completely open platform for the public. There is absolutely no need for any type of control or regulation at this point. They public will call for intervention if it is ever needed, just listen to them for advice.

Craig England
January 4, 2010, 8:00 pm
218 SW 76th Street
Lawton, Oklahoma 73505

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Bottom line up front: The internet currently operates efficiently in response to market demand, and allows for individual innovation and creativity in providing products and services that people want and can use. Excessive government regulation will only serve to encumber an already viable system and create more problems than solutions.

John Engles
January 4, 2010, 8:00 pm
52 Buie Road
Summertown, Tennessee 38483

PLEASE LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE AS IT IS. IT WORKS GREAT WITH OPENNESS AND FREEDOM FOR EVERYONE. PLEASE NO GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE. THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION OF MY COMMENTS.

John Engles
January 4, 2010, 8:02 pm
52 Buie Road
Summertown, Tennessee 38483

PLEASE LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE AS IT IS. IT WORKS GREAT WITH OPENNESS AND FREEDOM FOR EVERYONE. PLEASE NO GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE. THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONSIDERATION OF MY COMMENTS.

Carol English
January 4, 2010, 8:02 pm
9920 W. 34th Drive
Wheat Ridge, Colorado 80033

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Curtis Epperly
January 4, 2010, 8:03 pm
6067 Studley Rd
Mechanicsville, Virginia 23116

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In other words: KEEP THE GOVERNMENT OUT OF THE INTERNET. TO ALLOW THE GOVERNMENT ANY CONTROL WHATEVER IS ANOTHER STEP TOWARD TYRANNY.

eqiokpcil eqiokpcil
January 4, 2010, 8:03 pm

hanwvg@cqtsxl.com
hanwvg@cqtsxl.com

YMxzAQVQzagMBjEWgoa, Maine VTKYvQYyoO

UW5jNJ bxfugfaujype, [url=http://mwkcaxhipwa.com/]mwkcaxhipwa[/url],
[link=http://jqqvudrmdvys.com/]jqqvudrmdvys[/link], http://lnxyugdvtbg.com/

Don Erbel
January 4, 2010, 8:04 pm
345 Dolan Avenue
Mill Valley, California 94941

I have used the Internet since 1974 and I like it as it is.

I like it as it is, free and open.

Government regulation is against the freedom of the Internet.
Get your hands off of it.

In addition, as an Americans for Prosperity supporter, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank you for your attention to a basic tenet of a free society.

Kristi Etchberger
January 4, 2010, 8:05 pm
7225 Oakbank Drive
Glendora, California 91741

Leave the Internet alone. It works perfectly well without government interference. Americans do not want government involvement and it will be remembered at the next election.

Bill Etheredge
January 4, 2010, 8:06 pm
92 Veranda Lane
Ponte Vedra Beach, Florida 32082

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Darlene Eulie
January 4, 2010, 8:07 pm
1735 S. 88th St.
Omaha, Nebraska 68124

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Darlene Eulie

Linda Evans
January 4, 2010, 8:07 pm
4748 Calle de Nubes
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88012

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Major businesses depend on networks for doing business. Government needs to stay out of the way!

Daniel Evensizer
January 4, 2010, 8:07 pm
1836 A Street NE
Salem, Oregon 97301

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

My personal feeling is that this bill would take us toward what they have in PRC -- total gov't control of the internet.

I agree with the form letter remarks below, especially the one about 'no concrete evidence'. To restrict the freedom of the market place, which is really millions of consumers and thousands of competing ISPs, would require an exceptional emergency. There is no such emergency, so this is just another power grab by Congress. Limited gov't and trust in the responsibility of ordinary people is the American tradition. Let us keep it that way!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Donald Ewing
January 4, 2010, 8:07 pm
599N 850E
Wellsville, Utah 84339

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The government screws up everything they touch - please stay away from the internet.

Sherri Ezell
January 4, 2010, 8:07 pm
1013 Meridian St
Nashville, Tennessee 37207

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled only to be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which will inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Richard Fairbairn
January 4, 2010, 8:08 pm
5530 Donegal Rd.
Hubertus, Wisconsin 53033

I am an Americans for Prosperity activist and I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is a highly competitive marketplace. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Donna Fakler
January 4, 2010, 8:08 pm
54 Willow Lane
Winona, Minnesota 55987

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mel Falb II
January 4, 2010, 8:11 pm
14563 goudy rd
Dalton, Ohio 44618

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. KEEP THE GOVERNMENT OUT OF MY LIFE I ANSWER TO GOD NOT TO WASHINGTON & IT'S LIES & IT'S MAFIA TYPE OF GOVERNING. BACK OFF NOW I MEAN IT.

Judith Falk
January 4, 2010, 8:12 pm
7602 Barkwood Ct
Beltsville, Maryland 20705

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sharon Fanger
January 4, 2010, 8:13 pm
351 Jones Ave
South Haven, Michigan 49090

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

james farrell
January 4, 2010, 8:13 pm
9 sony run rd
newburgh, New York 12550

I object to increased government regulation and intrusion on the internet.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Tami Fasching
January 4, 2010, 8:15 pm
8811 W 132nd Terr
Overland Park, Kansas 66213

As an IT professional, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

TIM FAUST
January 4, 2010, 8:15 pm
223 S PARK DR APT C4
WOODBIDGE, New Jersey 7095

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Regards,
Tim

Dan Feldt
January 4, 2010, 8:16 pm
W168 N5068 Stonefield Rd.
Menomonee Falls, Wisconsin 53051

As an Americans, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

A transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

ANTHONY FENECH
January 4, 2010, 8:16 pm
597 N TURNBERRY DR
ORANGE, California 92869-2576

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either become crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not, on its own, set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM, that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years, starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”, that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Eileen Fernandez
January 4, 2010, 8:16 pm
7450 Haydon Lane
Shingletown, California 96088-9469

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Marino Fernandez
January 4, 2010, 8:19 pm
7450 Haydon Lane
Shingletown, California 96088-9469

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Stop the rules of restrictions on free access and expression.

Lee and Eren Fesko
January 4, 2010, 8:20 pm
2056 Wilson Pike
Franklin, Tennessee 37067

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

We are especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jim Fetting
January 4, 2010, 8:21 pm
1202 1/2 College ave
Huntington, Indiana 46750

China regulates their Internet and the people find ways around it. The tighter the control the more people will resist. We are the greatest nation in history because we have freedom. If we loose freedom then we are no longer a viable state and we will become anothe. Euro-socialist state. We are not China, the current leftist control is driving people back to the center. Each push to the left, leads us farther to the right.

Thanks,

Jim Fetting

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

robert fico
January 4, 2010, 8:21 pm
PO Box 807
Westfield, New Jersey 7090

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mark Field
January 4, 2010, 8:22 pm
12743 Pronghorn Oak
12743 Pronghorn Oak
San Antonio, Texas 78253

I am an Americans for Prosperity activist and I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney. Sorry but I do not believe that they have my best interests at heart and I do not want them infringing on my liberties or those of my neighbors.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Richard Field
January 4, 2010, 8:23 pm
2421 W. Peakview Ct.
Littleton, Colorado 80120

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Hands off the internet!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Greg Fillman
January 4, 2010, 8:24 pm
10631 176th Ave SE
Renton, Washington 98059

Is the year 1933? Is this Nazi Germany all over again?

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Susan Finegan
January 4, 2010, 8:24 pm
76 W Foster Maineville
Maineville, Ohio 45039

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52: LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE!!! this government has taken over enough of the PRIVATE sector. Soon, and you had better believe this, you will have started a vast exodus of educated, enterprising people who will be fleeing to other nations. AND THEN WHO IS GOING TO PAY ALL OF YOUR TAXES?

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Luke Finlay
January 4, 2010, 8:24 pm
PO Box 86
(5009 Cherry Point Road)
Woolford, Maryland 21677

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

As one of the early "players" dealing with the internet (I was the systems analyst who designed and installed the integration of our law publishing from editorial input all the way through to book production and data base development including our subscription book shipments AND individual client notification of new material dealing with specific points of law. The first "internet application" was our capturing the opinions of the highest two courts of Michigan as they were typed by a Justice's secretary in her office in the judge's home town, completed by our editorial department in Rochester, NY, handed down as a slip opinion in Lansing, Michigan, set in print at our plant in Webster, NY, assigning headnotes and pagination for future reference, and then publication.) After our system was up and running I went to Washington to help our government "get into the 20th century". The biggest hang-up potential users of our system had was to overcome problems caused by organized labor (our outfit was union free) and the AT&T monopoly (only governments could afford AT&T and only railroads and MAJOR trucking companies had their own telecommunications systems) so I started to work on the US government first. As we published the Lawyers' Edition of the Supreme Court Reports, we needed to get the court opinions in machine readable form.

The Government Printing Office (GPO) charged the Supreme Court \$35/page for printing their slip opinions. I offered to do it for \$3.50/page a 90% discount (and could have done it for nothing as it cost us more than \$3.50 to duplicate their work) but was turned down cold because of the union power at the GPO. Once I started on my selling job I was required to become a registered lobbyist; and with no axe to grind I registered as a representative for the free enterprise system -- the first and only lobbyist that wanted to give the government something rather than get something. The GPO was under the House Administration Committee whose Chairman Wayne Hays ran into trouble first announced in the Washington Post and after resigning his Committee chairmanship and his chairmanship of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee where he was "the dispenser of the funds" to the Democrats he finally resigned his seat in the House. The GPO was also under the Senate Rules and Administration Committee chaired by Sen. Howard Cannon of Nevada who failed to get reelected following the trial

and conviction of Roy Williams, President of the Teamsters Union, in which wiretap recordings and direct testimony discussed the very substantial bribe for Senator Cannon's help in defeating the deregulation of the trucking industry.

A lot has been done since 1980 despite the organization efforts of organized labor. If they had their way back in my day you guys wouldn't have this fight today. BUT LOOK AROUND -- THE FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM IS UNDER ATTACK AS BAD AS IT HAS EVER BEEN SINCE WE BECAME A COUNTRY.

Mildred Fischer
January 4, 2010, 8:26 pm
826 Lafayette Blvd
Fredericksburg, Virginia 22401

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. the government should not have control over anything except as allowed by the United States Constitution.

c fisher
January 4, 2010, 8:26 pm
po box 8199
yakima, Washington 98908

Do you believe in and support the First Amendment? If no, then why do you have the job you have? If yes, then stop the insanity of proposed government control of the internet.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Patricia Fitzgerald
January 4, 2010, 8:27 pm
4040 N. Golfview Drive
4040 N. Golfview Drive
Buckeye, Arizona 85396

Stay out of the Internet. Haven't you already managed to screw up social security, medicare, TARP funds, government take-over of banks, autos, now trying for healthcare, and the list goes on. Keep your hands off of our Internet. It runs fine without you and can only be guaranteed to fail once you get involved. First straighten out all the problems with terrorists being able to get on airplanes or bringing firearms onto Forts to kill our soldiers, then address the other issues previously mentioned above. If and when you can demonstrate that you can do something right, maybe the public would be willing to give you a shot at this. But for now, you're just playing politics and trying to punish anyone who actually makes money or believes in freemarket capitalism and you're rewarding all those content to be recipients of social services. Keep it up and enough Americans will revolt and have to dismantle everything that the government puts its dirty hands on.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Cheri Fitzwater
January 4, 2010, 8:27 pm
107 Barrington Drive
Liberty Hill, Texas 78642

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Cheri Fitzwater
January 4, 2010, 8:28 pm
107 Barrington Drive
Liberty Hill, Texas 78642

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Leonard Fitzwater
January 4, 2010, 8:30 pm
107 Barrington Drive
Liberty Hill, Texas 78642

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Leonard Fitzwater
January 4, 2010, 8:30 pm
107 Barrington Drive
Liberty Hill, Texas 78642

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dr. Michele Fleming
January 4, 2010, 8:31 pm
2843 Sweettholly Dr.
Jacksonville, Florida 32223

THE INTERNET SHOULD NOT BE CONTROLLED BY GOVERNEMENT. We do not want net neutrality or the internet as a public utility. I oppose these. If you allow this to happen you will destroy it and so much for freedom and liberty!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Kathleen Fleming
January 4, 2010, 8:32 pm
14051 NW Grandview Pl
Banks, Oregon 97106

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

You would be restricting my right to free speech on the internet if you start government regulations of it. Keep the government out of private industry!!!

Joseph Fletcher
January 4, 2010, 8:33 pm
400 N 17th St.
Nashville, Tennessee 37206

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I am against any more government regulations. Period.

Tim Flor
January 4, 2010, 8:34 pm
1521 Deer Trail Lks
Clarksville, Georgia 30523

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We The People are the government no the other way around. Remember that.

David Florea
January 4, 2010, 8:34 pm
PO Box 488
Donald, Oregon 97020

The best thing the FCC and government in general can do to foster the internet is to stay away from regulating it.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The proposed burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thomas Flores
January 4, 2010, 8:34 pm
21215 Villa Valencia
San Antonio, Texas 78258

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,
Thomas Flores

John Foell
January 4, 2010, 8:40 pm
6130 Deer Track Cove
Auburn, Indiana 46706-9323

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

It is not a proper function of the FCC to regulate the internet as it is not a broadcast service, a "public good" such as a radio/TV station and is not necessary to preserving life or safety (such as wire telephone service). It is also not a "natural monopoly" as a regulated telephone service is.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. Such rulings as proposed in this rulemaking will effectively "kill" the internet in the USA. Hands off!

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Evelyn Foffel
January 4, 2010, 8:45 pm
874 NE MM HWY
Knob Noster, Missouri 65336

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Net neutrality sounds so innocent, we know it is not!

William Folk
January 4, 2010, 8:46 pm
PO Box 488
Crestone, Colorado 81131

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ellen Follansbee
January 4, 2010, 8:47 pm
W159S7588 Quietwood Cr
Muskego, Wisconsin 53150

I am outraged and I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

HUBERT FOOTE
January 4, 2010, 8:49 pm
1405 CEDAR STREET
NICEVILLE, Florida 32578

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

"It does not make any sense for the government to even look at any project like this. We need the Government to look into protecting our nation, not bind it up in a bunch of useless laws that do nothing more than restrict our freedom". Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Linda Foote
January 4, 2010, 8:50 pm
1914 Waxleaf Green
Huntsville, Alabama 35803

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

No more government controls!

David A. Foran
January 4, 2010, 8:50 pm
65 Viewcrest Dr.
Kansas City, Kansas 66101

As an American Citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

S. Forbes
January 4, 2010, 8:52 pm
2900 First Avenue, Apt. N-408
2900 First Avenue, Apt. N-408
Seattle, Washington 98121

I want less government interference in markets, the internet and in my life. The Constitution is to restrain the government by providing limited enumerated powers. My elected representatives took an oath to protect and defend the Constitution and I expect them to do a better job, no a stellar job, in that effort. The FCC is likewise on notice. As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Denise Ford
January 4, 2010, 8:52 pm
1360 SW 179th Court
Aloha, Oregon 97006

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

STAY the HELL out of our LIVES!

Brad Forscher
January 4, 2010, 8:53 pm
6334 Ansley Cir
Lithia Springs, Georgia 30122

I oppose any and all interference by the FCC regarding the internet in anyway.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Scott Fortney
January 4, 2010, 8:55 pm
6960 Huntingdon Street
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17111

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Respectfully,

Scott A Fortney

Barbara Foster
January 4, 2010, 8:56 pm
122 10th St
Belford, New Jersey 7718

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This Government is taking over too much power ...Taking over free speech is socialism! Hands off!

R Foster
January 4, 2010, 8:56 pm
4377 Espirit Dr.
Fort Collins, Colorado 80524

I oppose the government takeover of the internet as this will mean more of government control of our freedom of speech.

L.A. Fox
January 4, 2010, 8:56 pm
2660 NE Hwy 20
Bend, Oregon 97701

As an American Citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

We are flawed. Each of us. All of us. That is why we limit the amount of power we give to any group or individual in our government.

You are flawed and do not have the wherewithall to turn the dials behind the curtain to run the internet. Leave it alone. If we need help, we'll give government power to help if necessary. We have not yet granted that power to the FCC or any public servant.

I repeat - YOU ARE FLAWED! Don't be so arrogant as to think that you know best when it comes to the internet.

L. A. Fox

Brian Fra
January 4, 2010, 8:56 pm
8649 Hillside Manor Dr
Springfield, Virginia 22152

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

William France
January 4, 2010, 8:57 pm
30680 Cypress Park Dr
Denham Springs, Louisiana 70726

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Keep government off Americans.

David Francois
January 4, 2010, 8:59 pm
3500 E Park Blvd, #601
Plano, Texas 75074

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Additionally, every piece of equipment used to bring the internet to the millions of homes and businesses in this country was purchased by private entities. The government has no business confiscating the equipment belonging to private entities or telling them how they can run their own networks.

John Frazier
January 4, 2010, 8:59 pm
6 Meltzer Court
Mount Vernon, Ohio 43050

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please listen to the people.

Brad Freberg
January 4, 2010, 8:59 pm
1127 S. 115th St.
West Allis, Wisconsin 53214

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

To advocate for government control, or regulation of anything in the interest of increasing competition, is laughable. With the exception of the military, the government is not capable of doing anything right. Look at "cash for clunkers" as evidence. The government couldn't run a kool-aid stand properly. I've got a program that the government could apply to almost all situations, and the result would be good for consumers, manufacturers, entities like the internet, people who want jobs, etc., and it would cost the taxpayers nothing. It is called, "THE STAY OUT OF IT ACT OF 2010".

Benedict Frederick, Jr
January 4, 2010, 9:00 pm
w3obv@msn.com
8129 Pinehurst Harbour Way
Pasadena, Maryland 21122

Regarding GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Glenda Frei
January 4, 2010, 9:01 pm
1187 Long Haul Rd
Grangeville, Idaho 83530

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

JoAnne Froemming
January 4, 2010, 9:01 pm
4 Albala Lane
Hot Springs Village, Arkansas 71909

As an Americans, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Federal Communications Commission is moving ahead with proposed "Open Internet" rules, which would give federal regulators vast new powers, and ultimately lead to government control of the Internet. This move is being attempted WITHOUT the consent of Congress and would directly affect our Constitutional right of free speech. Where does a Federal Agency get its authority to do this?

I am absolutely against the enactment of these rules!

Jack Frohbieter
January 4, 2010, 9:01 pm
34 Cranbury neck road
Cranbury, New Jersey 8512

I am submitting the following comment regarding GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am opposed to the concept of "Net Neutrality". Persons and companies that have invested in the infrastructure of the internet should have control of that resource. With all of the methods of accessing the Internet a private company that blocks or censors Internet traffic inappropriately will lose its customers to other suppliers. If government seizes control of the Internet, we will have no alternative if we are dissatisfied with our service. It appears the Commission intends to control traffic in ways it considers "fair". They have no right to do this. Transforming the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change and the Commission should not set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. To do so raises constitutional questions of taking of property. The Internet has become a great engine of innovation, growth, and expression. The heavy hand of government must not become its destroyer.

Jerry Fronabarger
January 4, 2010, 9:02 pm
1921 Manor Grove Road
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

There is no need to impose new restrictions on the Internet.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Paul Fruin
January 4, 2010, 9:03 pm
9461 SW Tauchman St.
Wilsonville, Oregon 97070

I am first and foremost a private citizen who will lend my name to any movement seeking to restrict the role of government in our lives. As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

ilene g
January 4, 2010, 9:03 pm
2407 Hal Circle
2407 Hal Circle
Baltimore, Maryland 21209

I WOULD LIKE TO BE A FREE PERSON- DON'T TAKE AWAY MY RIGHTS!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Barbara Gabbert
January 4, 2010, 9:04 pm
652 Spring St.
Allen, Texas 75002

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Keep our Internet free!

Michael Gabrysch
January 4, 2010, 9:05 pm
2102 Sherwin
Houston, Texas 77007

Keep America the land of the FREE...not the land of the biggest government in the world.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Donna Gaiger
January 4, 2010, 9:07 pm
22858 Papago Road
Apple Valley, California 92307-1196

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am opposed to the FCC "Open Internet" rule!

I support a truly open, competitive, privately owned and controlled network!

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ed Galicki
January 4, 2010, 9:10 pm
4227 Mt. Herbert Ave.
San Diego, California 92117

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

You may be officials, but you don't own the world. Keep your hands off of our internet. You have no authority or right to stake any claim of ownership or control of it.

Anne Galivan
January 4, 2010, 9:12 pm
337 Beaver Lake Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32312

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

William Galivan
January 4, 2010, 9:13 pm
337 Beaver Lake Rd
Tallahassee, Florida 32312

As a free citizen of the United States, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Bev Galloway
January 4, 2010, 9:14 pm
89257 UPL RT
Lynch, Nebraska 68746

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52: The Internet is a form of free speech and should be protected by the First Amendment. There is plenty of competition in place, and we do not need, or want, any government control and censorship.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Michael Gallie
January 4, 2010, 9:16 pm
640 McKnight st #B203
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I'd also like to add that anyone who supports this is a communist bastard and deserves a bullet in the head. I consider them enemies of the state.

ALBERT GALLOTTA
January 4, 2010, 9:18 pm
10790 Shadow Lane
Fairfax Station, Virginia 22039

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Joe Galuska
January 4, 2010, 9:20 pm
4500 Cherryland Street
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15214

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

STOP THIS COMMUNIST TAKE OVER NOW! WE WON'T STAND FOR IT!

Edwin Gantz
January 4, 2010, 9:22 pm
18830 NW Rock Creek Circle 262
Portland, Oregon 97229

As an Americans for Prosperity supporter, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Keep the internet truly OPEN and not encumbered by bureaucracy and invasive regulations which the FCC does not have authorization to do

Doug Garman
January 4, 2010, 9:22 pm
139 spruce dr.
Johnstown, Pennsylvania 15905

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

further more there are radio wave broadcastings for emergency purposes i say we use them and stop the argument that the national alert system needs more area on the net. use what is already in place and maintain it as part of the important infrastructure it is.

PJ. Garner
January 4, 2010, 9:23 pm
10080 Hart Ave
Huntington Woods, Michigan 48070

I fail to see any good in this proposal. The free market has regulated itself quite well with regards to the internet without interference from government entities. There has been no proof of any kind of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, and the idea of content restrictions (paragraph 77 of the NPRM) with the government as arbiter goes against the 1st Amendment.

Indeed, the current administration's labeling of those who disagree with it as "extremists" should be a wake-up call to everyone, for one day those who would stifle free speech with regulations will be on the other side of the table.

This is a really, really bad idea and whoever proposed it needs to be sent packing.

Ronnie Garner
January 4, 2010, 9:23 pm
14021 Wind Mountain Rd, NE
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87112

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent any business model that may be economically more efficient and better. This uncertainty will create litigation and impede investments. Any restriction would inhibit innovation and scare investors such that competition is prevented and rates go higher and particularly for the lowest wage earners in America. Investments and innovation would no longer make economic sense.

Lack of innovation would cripple the internet and then it would have to be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies. No one wants government control of such a rapidly evolving science because government control always favors the status quo, and this would inevitably lead to politicization and influence by members of congress. Eventually, a “public utility” model would arise as desired by many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

The Commission should not set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have not presented any evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior and there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of highly effective innovation, growth, and expression that the less regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ben Garnto
January 4, 2010, 9:24 pm
2706 Second Ave Columbus, GA
columbus, Georgia 31904

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. The obvious goal is control over the people and the message.

Evegene Garrison
January 4, 2010, 9:24 pm
15003 E 41st St S
Independence, Missouri 64055-4252

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

There is way more than enough government control of all aspects of our lives in the U.S. We don't need another one added to the list---we need to start subtracting from the list if we are to head in the right direction!!!!

Richard Garrison
January 4, 2010, 9:25 pm
1784 N. Decatur Road
G1
Atlanta, Georgia 30322

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The bottom line is that the government should have minimum to no control or regulation of the internet.

Richard Garrison
January 4, 2010, 9:26 pm
1536 Rockbridge Road
Stone Mountain, Georgia 30087

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The bottom line is that the government should have minimum to no control or regulation of the internet.

Larry Garver
January 4, 2010, 9:26 pm
2749A Mckinnie Rd
Grand Ridge, Florida 32442

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Larry

Donn Garvey, Jr.
January 4, 2010, 9:27 pm
9475 Cottonwood Lane
Leland, North Carolina 28451

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet free of government control and resulting censorship. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. The Internet should not be devolved into a public utility any more than a public university should.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Janet Gary
January 4, 2010, 9:29 pm
1235 twelve oaks ct
murrysville, Pennsylvania 15668

We cannot have Chinese-style internet control. Keep the government away from the internet!!

Patricia Garza
January 4, 2010, 9:30 pm
2560 W Dolbrook Way
Tucson, Arizona 85741

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Enough is enough...we will not live like those in China and Iran!

Patricia Garza
January 4, 2010, 9:31 pm
2560 W Dolbrook Way
Tucson, Arizona 85741

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This is America, we want our right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness without government interference in our internet, our health and our lives.

charles gazdik
January 4, 2010, 9:34 pm
5545 pathfinder
casper, Wyoming 82604

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

**FACT, YOU KEEP INTERFERING WITH THE AMERICAN LIFE AND YOU
WILL PAY!!!**

Karen Gearreald
January 4, 2010, 9:38 pm
1342 Cornwall Place
Norfolk, Virginia 23508

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I strenuously object to the FCC's proposed new rules regarding "net neutrality" or the so-called "Open Internet." Government must not takeover the Internet. The Internet must remain under private control and in private hands so that there is true freedom of expression and so that legal free enterprise is unencumbered.

deb geffe
January 4, 2010, 9:38 pm
1103 Blaine Rd
1103 Blaine Rd
granger, Washington 98932

no more government involvement in my life

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

George Gehrman
January 4, 2010, 9:40 pm
613 Sawtooth St.
Powell, Wyoming 82435

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Put simply, this is yet another attempt to grab by the federal government into an area where government intervention and control is simply unnecessary.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Rick Gemar
January 4, 2010, 9:41 pm
175 Childs Ave
Ogden, Utah 84404

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Keep government and Obamacrats out of control of the internet!!!!

Christine Genge
January 4, 2010, 9:41 pm
4815 E Carefree Hwy., A108-271
Cave Creek, Arizona 85331

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

We the people are sick and tired of BIG GOVERNMENT, NANNY POLICIES, and INTERVENTION where government is neither wanted or needed!!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dale Gerber
January 4, 2010, 9:42 pm
3141 Pleasant View Drive
Manheim, Pennsylvania 17545

As an Americans citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Eugene Gerczak
January 4, 2010, 9:43 pm
34772 Mute Swan Lane
Rehoboth Beach, Delaware 19971

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

In order for a society to remain free from government intrusion it must have an unrestricted means to voice it's concerns.

The first amendment of the Constitution provides that means of expression. However, that right can only be exercised if a means for expression exists. The internet, as it exists, provides that means.

A change in the rules governing the internet would dramatically adversely impact on the right of expression that I have guaranteed to me by the Constitution.

I am strongly opposed to any actions taken by members of Congress or the Administration to in any way alter the internet.

Robert Gerle, Sr.
January 4, 2010, 9:43 pm
16620 E. 107th Court
Commerce City, Colorado 80022

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

China controls thier population's internet. China is a Communist Country.

I hold a 1st Class 'Phone FCC license (no a General Class).

Robert Gernandt
January 4, 2010, 9:45 pm
P.O. Box 292883
Phelan, California 92329

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I feel the government has enough problems to solve without taking on the internet and a host international companies.

James Gerrish
January 4, 2010, 9:46 pm
116 Sanford Street
East Orange, New Jersey 7018

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. I do not want the USA to follow the restrictive examples of China and Iran in controlling the Internet.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James Gerritz
January 4, 2010, 9:47 pm
4111 S. Eliot St.
Sheridan, Colorado 80110

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Natashya Giardina
January 4, 2010, 9:47 pm
353 Thorncliff Landing
Acworth, Georgia 30101

As a concerned American citizen, who is a wife, mother, educator and one who values my rights and independence living in the USA, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

ABSOLUTELY DO NOT TAKE AWAY MY FREEDOM OF SPEECH.

Sincerely,
Natashya Giardina

EMILY GIBSON
January 4, 2010, 9:48 pm
4416 CARRICK COURT
CHESAPEAKE, Virginia 23321

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

SAY NO TO SOCIALISM AND THE GOVT THINKING FOR PEOPLE. MAKE PEOPLE THINK FOR THEMSELVES OR SUFFER THE CONSEQUENCES OF THEIR OWN ACTIONS OR LACK THEREOF.

Floyd Gibson
January 4, 2010, 9:48 pm
1824 Ceres Way
Sacramento, California 95864

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Government does not have a good record of giving its citizens the freedom to express themselves on the media. Government controls thoughts and speech. Our freedoms are in trouble if the FCC decides to control the internet. Don't do it.

Denise Giesler
January 4, 2010, 9:49 pm
5214 Highland Trail
Acworth, Georgia 30102

As an Americans for Prosperity supporter, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

David Gignac
January 4, 2010, 9:49 pm
3584 Argonne Ave.
#19 B
Norfolk, Virginia 23509

Let's stop the lunacy...the govmint can't run anything well and usually runs things at a deficit until they run into the ground (witness social security or The Post Office). I fear if GM doesn't disentangle themselves soon they will wind up in this same boat. Please let's not break something that works. Keep The Internet loose, free and OPEN

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Catherine Gilbert
January 4, 2010, 9:50 pm
630 Pine Meadow Drive
Zionsville, Indiana 46077

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. This is not acceptable.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney. Government control is not an option.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. You should not control the Internet.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized: I don't think so.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

You are an arm of the people of the United States of America. You do not have the authority to stifle this vital communication system. Be cautious of your choices.

Daniel Gilbert, Ph.D.
January 4, 2010, 9:50 pm
16231 Moorpark St.
Encino, California 91436

To Whom It May Concern:

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Drew Gill
January 4, 2010, 9:55 pm
2303 White Cliff Lane
Wichita, Kansas 67207

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I further wish to state that I don't trust governmental beauracracies such as the FCC to be aligned with the principles that made America great, such as free enterprise.

Dorrie Gillingham
January 4, 2010, 9:57 pm
774 Roguelea Lane
Grants Pass, Oregon 97526

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

With all that being said, I will fight to my last breath for SMALLER GOVERNMENT, just as our founding fathers intended.

GET OUT OF THE WAY OF THE PEOPLE!!

Catherine Gilstrap
January 4, 2010, 9:58 pm
110 Whipp Drive
Winchester, Virginia 22602

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously, it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002, letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dennis Gimlin
January 4, 2010, 9:58 pm
3238 Shalimar Terrace
Pueblo, Colorado 81008`

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet works fine, and we don't want the government mucking it up. Leave it alone!

Alan Gingras
January 4, 2010, 9:59 pm
48 Tsienneto Rd
Derry, New Hampshire 3038

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Donald Girvin
January 4, 2010, 10:02 pm
2099 Dean Road
Bethel, Ohio 45106

Keep your damned hands off of our liberty and freedom.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Eric Giunta
January 4, 2010, 10:04 pm
6946 Mariposa Circle Court
Pembroke Pines, Florida 33331

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

John Givens
January 4, 2010, 10:07 pm
15 Hickory Hills Circle
Little Rock, Arkansas 72212

As an American I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

A transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not, on its own, impose regulatory changes that will force the internet to change.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, which is the case there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

LOIS GIVENS
January 4, 2010, 10:07 pm
597 N. TURNBERRY DR
ORANGE, California 92869-2576

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Michael Glanz
January 4, 2010, 10:08 pm
16212 Bothell-Evt. Hwy
Mill Creek, Washington 98012

As an American political activist (We the People) are interested in the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Diane Glass
January 4, 2010, 10:08 pm
509 Church St.
Middletown, New Jersey 7748

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In other words, Big Government Stay Out!!

gmnlw gmnlw
January 4, 2010, 10:13 pm
brJsJMrXjUHVwV
myXrfuWqQb
New York, Montana 2204

DDpcpE hmbzyifpkoc, [url=http://hnyjtwozeww.com/]hnyjtwozeww[/url],
[link=http://jmekpaqyekyh.com/]jmekpaqyekyh[/link], http://rcwfyatrztz.com/

B.G. and Carol Godec
January 4, 2010, 10:13 pm
5606 Dusty Chaps Drive
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80923

As an Americans for Prosperity supporter, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Christopher Godellas
January 4, 2010, 10:14 pm
2660 Constitution Court
Lindenhurst, Illinois 60046

To Whom It May Concern:

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,

Christopher Godellas

Douglas Godfrey
January 4, 2010, 10:14 pm
127 East Street
Duxbury, Massachusetts 2332

As an American citizen, opposed to the socialist, big-government, big spending agenda of President Obama, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am adamantly opposed to the Federal Communications Commission proposed "Open Internet" rules, which would give federal regulators vast new powers, and ultimately lead to government control of the Internet.

John Gonzales
January 4, 2010, 10:14 pm
7741 Lookout Drive
La Jolla, California 92037

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I would also add that since the internet is used as a form of expression, debate and opinion that it holds the same first amendment rights as news papers, magazines, and TV news broadcasts enjoy. For the FCC, a non legislative office, to force regulations on the internet and people of America who use it without due process is a clear violation of the first amendment of the constitution.

Deborah Gonzalez
January 4, 2010, 10:16 pm
11909 Gran Crique Ct. S.
Jacksonville, Florida 32223

As an Americans for Prosperity and As A Mom activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Russell Good
January 4, 2010, 10:17 pm
6360 300th Ave NE
North Branch, Minnesota 55056

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Please stop and consider how badly this will make the economy plunge even further. Nothing is gained but control by the government and that much control is angering all Americans.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sally Goodfellow
January 4, 2010, 10:18 pm
8546 Brookings Drive
Charlotte, North Carolina 28269

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket

The Internet should not, under any circumstances, be Government-controlled!

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Heavens no!

Frankie Ann Goodson
January 4, 2010, 10:19 pm
420 Mesa Dr. Apt. I-33
Little Rock, Arkansas 72211

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Please do not do this. Leave us some freedom. Please, please don't do this to us.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James Goodwin
January 4, 2010, 10:20 pm
1021 Ravine Ter
Jacksonville, Florida 32259

Continue to monitor, but do not make new laws that restrict free competition. Only act when a situation becomes aggrevious as you have apparently done in the past.

The free market will police the companies. We don't want or need more government oversight and interference we want less!

Jim Goodwin

Deanna S Gordinier
January 4, 2010, 10:22 pm
9701 DANWOOD LN NW
#2
SILVERDALE, Washington 98383

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I can barely afford the internet, which should be free for everyone, I definitely cannot afford Cable or Dish T.V.

Cynthia Gordon
January 4, 2010, 10:25 pm
8009 Little Deer Crossing
Austin, Texas 78736

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank you,
Page Gordon

Pat Gorman
January 4, 2010, 10:25 pm
1028 St. Margarets Dr.
Annapolis, Maryland 21409

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If government exercised control over the Internet, private companies would suffer.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The FCC should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Brian Gorrell
January 4, 2010, 10:25 pm
12005 S.W. 1st ST
Yukon, Oklahoma 73099

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The most important aspect of the internet boils down to one word only: FREEDOM. The idea of "net neutrality" is an insane double standard because on the internet everyone has a voice, and everyone has freedom of speech. If you don't agree with a website, then leave! If an attempt is made to regulate or control the internet, the most important of all American rights, FREEDOM OF SPEECH, will be destroyed! The American people can not, and will not stand for this in my humble opinion.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Stand with the American people for FREEDOM of SPEECH, not additional government control taking us further and further from the basic ideals upon which this country was founded!

Steve Gorzak
January 4, 2010, 10:26 pm
988 Ascot Drive
Elgin, Illinois 60123

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Robert Gottschalk
January 4, 2010, 10:28 pm
428 Collinsford Road
Tallahassee, Florida 32301

As an American citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I object to any attempt by MY government to control any activity that does not violate a law of crime or limits in any way competitive business. As a tax payer for all my live, I expect every government official to respect my wishes as one of the people that pay government salaries. Therefore, the following statement specific to GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Karen Goulet
January 4, 2010, 10:29 pm
329 Palmetto Rd
Nokomis, Florida 34275

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:
KEEP FREE ENTERPRISE FREE! THAT IS WHAT MADE OUR NATION GREAT BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT GOT INVOLVED.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Norman Gowens
January 4, 2010, 10:30 pm
7025 Harvey Dr.
Waco, Texas 76710

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In case you haven't heard, Americans want less government control, not more.

Warren Grabow
January 4, 2010, 10:38 pm
1057 Juniper
Atwater, California 95301

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.
Please leave the internet alone.

August Grammas
January 4, 2010, 10:38 pm
4376 Cove Island Drive
Marietta, Georgia 30067

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

Additionally, crippling private companies will reduce future tax revenues - a stupid path to take in the current economy.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Glenda Grandioso
January 4, 2010, 10:38 pm
58 Sherman Place
Garfield, New Jersey 7026

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Keep the government out of the internet it is already into my business enough.

Linda Grant
January 4, 2010, 10:39 pm
912 Highland Ave.
P.O.Box 174
Pitcairn, Pennsylvania 15140

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Leave the internet alone! Americans do not need government interference in this area.

W.H. Grant
January 4, 2010, 10:40 pm
29 Linden Av
Asheville, North Carolina 28801

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously, it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden-of-proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

William Grant
January 4, 2010, 10:46 pm
912 East F Street
Rainier, Oregon 97048

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Are you listening?

Your corrupt behavior will not be tolerated much longer by the honest, decent and hard-working citizens of this country. We the people are fed up with your strong-arm tactics. Your "open Internet" ploy is just one more element of your corrupt struggle to gain power and control over the principled people of this nation.

With all due respect to your position -- we the people have watched long enough, as you, the "rulers of darkness", have expanded your authoritarian supremacy behind closed doors, at midnight, on weekends and in all areas of executive and congressional accountability. You have become drunkards in the quest for power and control. Be aware that in the end the truth will win.

Thank you.

John Graves
January 4, 2010, 10:48 pm
3799 Windyke Dr.
Memphis, Tennessee 38125

I am deeply concerned about the FCC and their plans to take over the internet. We do not need any more Government takeover of any organization that continues to gobble up more power from the American people than they already have.

John Graves

John Green
January 4, 2010, 10:48 pm
7936 White Oak Ave
Northridge, California 91325

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

General comment. I am far more worried about the government interfering with Internet access than I am about any private company. Any such attempt by a private company would be met with marketplace restraints and public outrage (probably over the internet!), and would be self regulating. Lawful Internet use is pretty much free from government restriction, and that is the optimum for a democratic society; government control of any media should be restricted to the least amount possible. If problems develop with service providers, THAT is the time to consider rules. I don't think that a "pre-emptive" set of rules is necessary or desirable.

Having said that, here are some suggestions on specific items:

I think that rule 5 should specifically allow service providers to offer different service levels, i.e., access speeds. The language appears to be so broad that it could be construed that providers have to give all users the same speed.

It should be understood and clearly defined that in some cases high bandwidth use by one customer might restrict the access of other users to the internet. That is, someone who is constantly downloading movies or Peer-to-peer content might use up so much bandwidth that other users have degraded capabilities. Thus, the rules should specifically allow the access providers to restrict certain types of activities **ONLY IF THEY ARE ADVERSELY AFFECTING BANDWIDTH**, and **ONLY FOR THE LIMITED TIME REQUIRED FOR NETWORK HEALTH**. The way the proposed rules are written, they may keep companies from protecting the bandwidth of all users.

Rule 6 should have language that protects an access provider from having to disclose to the public any proprietary technology relating to bandwidth and network throughput maintenance. Such technology could be available to the Commission, but a company may have serious investments in technology that should be protected.

Robert Green
January 4, 2010, 10:49 pm
133 Brookwood Trail
Waleska, Georgia 30183

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Robert Green

william greene
January 4, 2010, 10:50 pm
201 n 4th ave
royersford, Pennsylvania 19468

keep the government out of the internet

Dorothy Greer
January 4, 2010, 10:50 pm
2028 Malabar Lakes Dr NE
Palm Bay, Florida 32905

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. Government should not be involved in controlling the internet. This goes against everything that America stands for.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney. Government regulation would do away with a freedom we all have now.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. The Constitution does not allow for this.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Stop this attempt to take over another free enterprise.

Richard Greer
January 4, 2010, 10:50 pm
197 Camino del Mundo Dr
Fort Collins, Colorado 80524

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The internet is not broken in its present state. Leave it alone.

Todd Greer
January 4, 2010, 10:51 pm
225 Smith Rd
St. Charles, Illinois 60174

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

It is disheartening when government can not seem to leave innovation and proven private enterprise alone because it does not deliver the message they would like to hear.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Let us not corrupt what has made this country great, free enterprise and entrepreneurs. Government control leads ultimately to waste and corruption; see the former Soviet Union.

Linda Gregory
January 4, 2010, 10:52 pm
3057 1/2 Gunnison Ave
Grand Junction, Colorado 81504

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We have the luxury of being able to communicate ideas, knowledge, information and in a country which under its constitution has freedom of speech as it's 1st amendment right. I see that Liberal Facism is alive and well under this administration.

Chris Greninger
January 4, 2010, 10:53 pm
104 Lanita Drive
Roland, Oklahoma 74954

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Keep your hands off my internet.

Richard Greninger
January 4, 2010, 10:53 pm
277 Ida Red Drive
Leesport, Pennsylvania 19533

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to legitimately turn except the courts.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that can otherwise be economically efficient. This will create litigation issues.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or would be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, .

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility should be debated in Congress by the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. An inexperienced Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mary Grez
January 4, 2010, 10:53 pm
158 Hillside Dr
158 Hillside Dr
Neptune, New Jersey 07753-5500

Ours is a government of the people, for the people, and by the people.

I am one of "the people".

The government has no business, no right, to control the internet.

If the government tries to control the internet, there will be more outrage than has been seen thus far.

Many, many people, unfortunately, still believe that this government does not want to control us.

An internet takeover will quickly convince them otherwise.

And people will not be fooled by a "bailout scheme" where the internet is concerned.

You would be wise to make certain that the internet is not controlled by the government.

We, the people, are watching.

Michelle Griffin
January 4, 2010, 10:55 pm
908 JB Walker Road
New Market, Alabama 35761

Not interested in socialized media/internet/communications

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Michael Griffith
January 4, 2010, 10:56 pm
105 Mauldin Drive
Alpharetta, Georgia 30004

As an American Citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ted Grimes
January 4, 2010, 11:01 pm
2908 14th Ave S
Seattle, Washington 98144

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In short, Regulators should regulate existing statutes - not create new policy by stretching or making up new rules based on political issues. That last role belongs to Congress. You only implement existing policy.

Brian Griset
January 4, 2010, 11:04 pm
26 Cullen Way
Exeter, New Hampshire 3833

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Free Market system created the wide diversity and explosive growth in the internet. Creation of additional regulations will cause "unintended" consequences which will result in the stagnation of this "American" product/service thereby allowing other countries to leap frog ahead of american innovation and cost U.S. citizens more jobs like those lost due to over regulation of other American industries! Enough is enough!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

David Grosmann
January 4, 2010, 11:09 pm
483 Woodland Place
Pittsboro, Indiana 46167

Has the Obama administration ever heard of the First Amendment???? IT'S FREEDOM OF SPEECH. You politicians have turned your job into a gravey train to fill your pockets and take away every freedom this country was founded on, thus insuring your re-election by the lazy who are looking for a "free lunch" and illegal aliens who you are to the leagal voters to where they can vote for you. If you had to depend on Social Security, you'd get it fixed. If you didn't have your insanely ridiculous retirements, which you were able to give yourselves, you'd fix the economy. But where is your money???? Shipped to investments overseas where the rules you cram down our throats don't apply to you. You are nothing but CROOK LAWYERS who are interested in nothing by being re-elected. And I do believe that there should be term limits on every politician.....first term in office, and the second in PRISON!!!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Larry Gross
January 4, 2010, 11:09 pm
155 Bittersweet Lane
Berryville, Virginia 22611

Re: GN Docket No 09-191, WC Docket No, 07-52. I am opposed to a government controlled internet. Today's Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and "cable" companies struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

In this complex world, I think it unwise to create a situation where difficult internet issues can only be solved with taxpayer subsidies leading to government control and politicization.

Any effort to change the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

RW Gross
January 4, 2010, 11:10 pm
360 Williamsburg Dr.
Avon Lake, Ohio 44012

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I strongly urge you to halt steps to establish a federal regulatory body that interferes with a free market mechanism.

Lorna Grow
January 4, 2010, 11:10 pm
22294 R. Ave
Dallas Center, Iowa 50063

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. Private competition works best.

The burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business that could be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which will bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. Don't allow government ownership.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may eventually be the arbiter.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Kim Gruetzmacher
January 4, 2010, 11:13 pm
800 Marquette Ave
Suite 100
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.
Keep your hands off my internet. How about keeping us safe?

MJ Gsell
January 4, 2010, 11:14 pm
11 Masters Ct.
Little Egg Harbor, New Jersey 8087

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Earl Gudeman
January 4, 2010, 11:14 pm
4509 Northwood Drive
Roanoke, Virginia 24017

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ron Guenette
January 4, 2010, 11:21 pm
2365 Damon Drive
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80918

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. If this is voted in by the current members of congress/senate, we will vote you out ASAP

Timothy Guest
January 4, 2010, 11:23 pm
560 Thomas Rd., Bolingbrook, IL
Bolingbrook, Illinois 60440

Re: GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Treating the Internet as a government-controlled public utility is a monumental mistake. Hasn't anyone there picked up on the fact that regulation inhibits progressive creativity, free speech and economic development?

Is it true the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized? Is this not government control of "free speech"?

Michael Guillory
January 4, 2010, 11:26 pm
8415 NC 42 W
Kenly, North Carolina 27542

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Try reading the Constitution you supposedly swore to protect, and keep your power-hungry, busy-body hands off of our freedoms!

Carol Gunderson
January 4, 2010, 11:28 pm
916 Seven Lakes, North
West End, North Carolina 27376

WAKE UP AMERICA..... HERE GOES ANOTHER OF OUR FREEDOMS. WE MUST STOP THE RUINATION OF OUR COUNTRY BY OBAMA AND HIS GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP PLANS!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

David Gunnells
January 4, 2010, 11:28 pm
2115 PINE LN
HOOVER, Alabama 35226

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Paul Gunville
January 4, 2010, 11:35 pm
5308 Remington Dr
Alexandria, Virginia 22309

As an avid user of the internet as it is today, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mark Gurley
January 4, 2010, 11:37 pm
8180 Freska Lake Dr
Comstock Park, Michigan 49321

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

We are not interested in you asserting your set of values, beliefs and agendas over yet another free form of information exchange and commerce. Federal regulators and non-elected bureaucrats were never supposed to control and regulate communication and information exchange. Nowhere in the US Constitution are they given any authority to control or regulate free speech, free enterprise or free information exchange. In fact, it actually sets forth prohibitions against this.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Bruce Guthrie
January 4, 2010, 11:40 pm
6406 135th pl SW
Edmonds, Washington 98026

"Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or the press." Rule number ONE.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Edward Gutowski
January 4, 2010, 11:49 pm
19420 Laurel
Livonia, Michigan 48152

Although the comments below are from a "form", I have read it and agree with every part of it. Please consider the comments below as my own.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dane Guzzetta
January 4, 2010, 11:50 pm
56 Howder St.
Hillsdale, Michigan 49242

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In addition, in this economic climate, unnecessary regulation of business activity and investment should be reduced. And most certainly not increased.

Richard Gyuro
January 4, 2010, 11:53 pm
13856 weowna way
white city, Oregon 97503

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We don't need you Marxists in the Obama administration censoring our internet content.

Brian Haas
January 4, 2010, 11:54 pm
1201 Lester Rd
Sunnyside, Washington 98944

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

LESS REGULATION IS BETTER!!!!!!!!!!

Dorothy Haas
January 4, 2010, 11:54 pm
2070 Forest Dr,
Clearwater, Florida 33763

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Note: Having chosen to join in the sending of the above comments by those far more knowledgeable than I, it is my sincere hope and prayer that you who receive this communication, will handle it, as well as other similar messages, with the utmost of consideration for what is asked for by the people who cast votes for men and women to serve the people of this country. The focus is on being a Public Servant, with a conscience that is reliably accountable to what is right in the eyes of God. Thank you for doing what is right; not just 'politically correct'!

robert haas
January 4, 2010, 11:55 pm
6718 whittier ave
suite 200
McLean, Virginia 22101

As a practicing attorney, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is now highly competitive and I use it extensively in my legal practice. There is no abuse that I can discern and in fact it is highly beneficial and very competitive! Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, it would become slow cumbersome and bureaucratic by definition.

The Internet would then either become crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this archaic "public utility" model is unfortunately the actual desired outcome of many proponents of this regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

thank you for considering my comments, Bob Haas

Joanne Hack
January 4, 2010, 11:58 pm
122 Ham Rd
Barrington, New Hampshire 3825

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, agree wholeheartedly with the following message and I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This is still America. Let's keep it that way.

Judy Hackel
January 5, 2010, 12:09 am
1953 Lakeside Place
Green Bay, Wisconsin 54302

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Amanda Halbert
January 5, 2010, 12:12 am
8435 River Rd
Wilmington, North Carolina 28412

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

My understanding is that the WWW stands for World Wide Web. How can the leftist Marxist regime in Washington expect to become the world's internet police state considering that they pass laws that protect certain internet predators under the guise of the 1st Amendment? Leave the internet alone!

Kaylie Halbrook
January 5, 2010, 12:25 am
304 Woodland Dr.
Fuquay Varina, North Carolina 27526

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I believe that the internet market has the power to regulate itself. There are a multiplicity of companies offering internet service. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Thank you for your consideration of my concerns.

Heide Halik
January 5, 2010, 12:28 am
2661 Solomons Island Road
Edgewater, Maryland 21037

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that must be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,
Heide Halik

James Hall
January 5, 2010, 12:28 am
1011 Anchor Bay West
Greensboro, Georgia 30642

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please refrain from misguidedly imposing regulations that would actually crush competition and remove investment incentive from private providers.

Kay Hall
January 5, 2010, 12:28 am
110 Bayberry Rd
Versailles, Kentucky 40383

As a citizen of the USA, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Larry and Susan Hall
January 5, 2010, 12:32 am
9381 E Mountain Spring Rd
Scottsdale, Arizona 85255

As Americans for Prosperity activists, we are submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

We are especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Judith Halston
January 5, 2010, 12:32 am
2817 E. Glencove St
Mesa, Arizona 85213

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become

Deborah Halverson
January 5, 2010, 12:32 am
13559 Grosse Pointe
San Diego, California 92128

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

The transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. This is yet another circumvention of the government due process.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. The overwhelming absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, confirms there is no rationale to restrict free market internet that adversely effect innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

John Hamlin
January 5, 2010, 12:42 am
1699 Dunstable Green
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is competitive. Traditional “phone” and “cable” companies have been locked in a struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jane Hamman
January 5, 2010, 12:42 am
P O Box 164
Clancy, Montana 59634

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

G HAMPSON
January 5, 2010, 12:44 am
7003 SANDY HOOK CIRCLE
CHANHASSEN, Minnesota 55317

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Kevin Hampton
January 5, 2010, 12:48 am
1975 Kettle side Ct
Richfield, Wisconsin 53076

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Margaret Hampton
January 5, 2010, 12:49 am
987 N Suncoast Blvd
Crystal River, Florida 34429

As a concerned American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet.

GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously, it would lose its customers.

But if government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership.

Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government.

The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

That would be a dictatorial restraint without representation that could choke the lifeblood of the free exchange of information, ideas, news, opinions, business, and personal communication throughout this country, causing deprivation of freedoms and financial hardships on business and inventions.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM ...that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Bottom Line: Do not impose new regulations that could destroy private investment in the internet, and unlawfully could destroy our freedoms of speech and communication. You are paid with tax dollars to serve - not strangle - the people and communication systems in these United States.

Mark Hancock
January 5, 2010, 12:56 am
po box 5
Fannin, Texas 77960

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please let freedom and the constitution rule this country.
Government doesn't create rights; government creates slaves!

Richard Handy
January 5, 2010, 12:57 am
5481 mississippi drive
fairfield, Ohio 45014

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This is yet another example of too much government in our lives.

Pat Hankamp
January 5, 2010, 12:59 am
3045 Oak
St. Ignace, Michigan 49781

NET NEUTRALITY MUST BE STOPPED...As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Colin Hanna
January 5, 2010, 1:04 am
603 Fairway Drive
West Chester, Pennsylvania 19382

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Let me make my comment simple: The government has no more business determining what content should and should not be carried on the Internet than it does in determining content in a newspaper. Under the guise of such sweet-sounding terms as "neutrality" and "openness," it appears to me that just the opposite is likely to occur if the FCC expands its control over the Internet by assuming or acquiring the power over content that is rightly exercised by Internet service providers. The best way to assure "neutrality" and "openness" on the Internet is to make all legislative and regulatory control over Internet content impermissible.

Thank you for your attention.

Colin
Colin A. Hanna
President
Let Freedom Ring
www.LetFreedomRingUSA.com

Jack Hannan
January 5, 2010, 1:04 am
3740 Metairie Hgts Ave
Metairie, Louisiana 70002

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Government workers are not capable of administering to the needs of the Internet and they can only screw it up.

Walt Hannon
January 5, 2010, 1:07 am
2351 W NW HWY Suite 1300
Dallass, Texas 75220

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52: GET OUT OF OUR LIVES !

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dave Hansen
January 5, 2010, 1:12 am
197 Ramapo Rd.
Garnerville, New York 10923

As an American and a military veteran, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

KATHY HANSEN
January 5, 2010, 1:13 am
1909 SANDY LAKE DRIVE
FRIENDSWOOD, Texas 77546

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. I do not want this taken over by the government! If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. This is unconstitutional and defeats FREE SPEECH. We must have government get out of communications business--it has no right to be there unless it is specifically authorized for defense purposes--not to censor our citizens and their private business.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney. These people are not who we need or want in our government..

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. THIS IS UNFAIR!!!

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. PLEASE GET GOVERNMENT OUT OF THIS PRIVATE BUSINESS.

Sincerely,

Kathy Hansen, MD

bryan hanson
January 5, 2010, 1:18 am
13721 e. lehigh ave.
aurora, Colorado 80014

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Daniel Hanson
January 5, 2010, 1:32 am
82299 200th st
Hayward, Minnesota 56043

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,
Daniel Hanson

Jan Hanson
January 5, 2010, 1:43 am
5959 S 12 St #106
Tacoma, Washington 98465 1902

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a g o v e r n m e n t - controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content r e s t r i c t i o n s, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing a l a r m bells now for so many y e a r s (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Richard Hanson
January 5, 2010, 1:46 am
5959 S 12 St #106
Tacoma, Washington 98465 1902

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Please do not be bought off. We need the FCC to be nonpartisan.

If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Paul Hardy
January 5, 2010, 2:23 am
3110 Cherry Palm Drive
Tampa, Florida 33619

As an Americans for Prosperity concerned citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Our government seems to have enough problems under the current administration and can't even manage what they have now. Taking a program of Health Care that works for 80% of the population and breaking it to work for 20% of the population. How can they possibly effectively manage more with this kind of shortsighted vision towards socialism?

Get your own house in order and then we can vote(yes, this is America, on whether or not to give the government more power.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul

Daniel Harney
January 5, 2010, 2:44 am
1242 maple dr.
1242 maple dr.
Enumclaw,, Washington 98022

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I stand against this potential government interference and control. No socialism, or communism in america.

Christopher Harris
January 5, 2010, 3:04 am
101 Azalea Point Dr. South
Ponte Vedra Beach, Florida 32082

Re: GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Please do not let this misguided, Orwellian-named piece of legislation go through.

If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. People move over to a competitor and the free market does its thing. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive, will lower ROI and make further investment economically unfeasible.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Barbara A. Harrison
January 5, 2010, 3:07 am
4 Larison Lane
Ringoes, New Jersey 8551

Government needs to stay out of the internet and stay out of our lives. Government is already too intrusive and meddling in every area of private life. Leave the internet alone!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Gwen Harrison
January 5, 2010, 3:11 am
5416 Flag Tail Lane
Crestview, Florida 32539

Any attempt to control the Internet, other than to ban pornography therefrom, is a clear violation of the right to free speech set forth in the First Amendment.

The current proposal for "net neutrality" is simply the thinly-veiled plan of the current White House administration, which is dominated by members of the Democratic party, to revoke the First Amendment rights of those who don't agree with them (i.e., Republicans, Libertarians, and Independents).

The Internet is a fabulous vehicle for information sharing and commerce. Allowing the Federal government to gain any control over it would negatively affect its ability to function as efficiently as it does now. And, any detrimental effects on the Internet will have economic repercussions for our country.

I am all for doing anything to eradicate pornography from the Internet. That seriously needs to be done. However, I do not believe it requires further government control of the Internet to accomplish such an objective.

Please stay out of the Internet. Find another way to infringe on the First Amendment rights of conservatives!

Joe Harrison
January 5, 2010, 3:15 am
2571 Aspen Cove Drive
Vestavia Hills, Alabama 35243

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

America has always stood for freedom of speech and expression. It's a 1st amendment right. The government takeover of the internet is a direct violation of this citizen right. The government has no right to control or censor the internet.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sam D. Harrison
January 5, 2010, 3:39 am
355 Horseshoe Bend Road
Goldendale, Washington 98620

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

As I see it, there are only two things now keeping this nation from complete Socialist/Communist takeover and control:

First is the Second Amendment to the Constitution.

Second is the open use of the Internet.

If those who would deprive the citizens of the United States of the continued implementation of both or either of these entities are successful, the control of the Socialists/Communists will be complete within a very short period of time.

Where do you stand on this?

Corinne Harrup
January 5, 2010, 3:56 am
1704 Forest Hills Dr
Harker Heights, Texas 76548

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I would like you to record my opposition to new regulations that change the way the internet has grown and developed. Freedom of speech has always been a priority in this country and it should remain so.

Thank you,
Corinne Harrup

John Hart
January 5, 2010, 4:00 am
811 Fairway Cove Lane
Suite 204
Bradenton, Florida 34212

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52: I will move my company out of the US if this Docket is passed that will cause 6 people in the US to be dropped and I will rehire in Mexico.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Timothy Hart
January 5, 2010, 4:04 am
7275 Claybeck dr.
Dayton, Ohio 45424

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Flat Tax
Less Government

bob hatfield
January 5, 2010, 4:08 am
34 clayridge ct
bowling green, Kentucky 42103

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

DO NOT TAKE ANY FURTHER CONTROL OVER THE INTERNET. WE FLOAT FROM ONE PARTISAN REGIME TO ANOTHER. ALL OF YOU PARTISANS NEED TO KEEP YOUR MITS OFF OF COMMUNICATIONS.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thomas Hauck
January 5, 2010, 4:29 am
605 Fearington Post
Pittsboro, North Carolina 27312

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Richard Havard
January 5, 2010, 4:38 am
1600 Stillhouse Hollow
Prosperq, Texas 75078

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Darrell Hawkins
January 5, 2010, 4:44 am
7 South Longwood Lane
Alexandria, Kentucky 41001

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

No more government control of information! Everything you get into gets worse. Leave we, the people, alone!

Steven Hawkins
January 5, 2010, 4:45 am
13214 rocky ridge ranch
Bonneville, Arkansas 72927

AMERICAN TALKING!!! THANK YOU I PAY YOUR SALARY! I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

BULL STUFF! I WANT NO CONTROLS ON MY INTERNET!!!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Winston Hawkins
January 5, 2010, 4:55 am
127 Sea Hawk Dr. W
Duck, North Carolina 27949

This is a ridiculous power grab attempt by the government. I believe this to be unethical and monopolistic in its very nature.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

John Hayden
January 5, 2010, 5:06 am
6311 N. lakepont Place
Parker, Colorado 80134

The following statement reflects not only my beliefs but also millions of Americans who strongly disagree with the current FCC agenda!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Zora Hays
January 5, 2010, 5:37 am
P. O. Box 18145
Asheville, North Carolina 28814

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

Please leave the internet free and enjoyable and allow us to have a great instrument in our daily life without the crippling influence of government control. Thank you,

We, The People, are going to be watching for any infringement on our internet freedoms. Zora Reece Hays

JOHN HECIMOVICH
January 5, 2010, 5:38 am
9687 WELK CT
MYRTLE BEACH, South Carolina 29572

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Stop your intrusion into our freedoms.

John Hecimovich

William Hecker
January 5, 2010, 5:47 am
12623 Timberglen Terrace
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80921

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank you

William Hecker
Colorado

William Hecker
January 5, 2010, 5:51 am
12623 Timberglen Terrace
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80921

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This makes no sense and will hurt the US economy that is already in deep straights due to the present Administration's mistakes in dealing with the situation.

Bill Hecker

Carol Hehmeyer
January 5, 2010, 5:51 am
1966 Tice Valley Blvd., #507
1966 Tice Valley Blvd., #507
Walnut Creek, California 94595

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I believe these proposed government controls would be, in the long run, a severe restriction on freedom of speech and inevitably, would lead to further destruction of the freedoms guaranteed to us in our Constitution.

David Heil
January 5, 2010, 5:54 am
160 Itasca Rd
Rio Rancho, New Mexico 87124

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Nickolette Heimer
January 5, 2010, 5:56 am
106 Boulder Hill Pass
Montgomery, Illinois 60538

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Please do not let government be in control of the Internet - which started out as an American FREE ENTERPRISE. There is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank you!

Jill Heins
January 5, 2010, 6:05 am
7833 Garnett
Lenexa, Kansas 66214

As a member of Americans for Prosperity, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no alternative.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent economically efficient business models. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

David Helffrich
January 5, 2010, 6:07 am
1628 Lone Hickory Rd
Yadkinville, North Carolina 27055

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,
David Helffrich

Lynn Heller
January 5, 2010, 6:07 am
3704 Deerfield Drive
Burlington, North Carolina 27215

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The less government intervention-the better-we do not need more FEDERAL employees on my taxpayer back!!

Sherry Hellmuth
January 5, 2010, 6:08 am
8450 Country Lane
DeKalb, Illinois 60115

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Stop the unnecessary government intrusion and intervention in peoples' lives.

Regards,

Sherry Hellmuth

maryanne helms
January 5, 2010, 6:20 am
220 Northbrooke Court
Woodstock, Georgia 30188

I am an American woman. A wife. A mother. I am also a fighter. And as an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Pam Heminger
January 5, 2010, 6:22 am
9812 Pebble Weigh Ct.
Burke, Virginia 22015

I want to say that I am strongly, strongly against the movement for "Open Internet" or "Net Neutrality". I do not want further regulation of the internet by the government.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Pam Heminger
January 5, 2010, 6:24 am
9812 Pebble Weigh Ct.
Burke, Virginia 22015

I am against government regulation of the internet!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Paul Hempfling Jr.
January 5, 2010, 6:24 am
P. O. Box 210
Chriesman, Texas 77838

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

~~~ And I do sincerely agree with the entire letter above.

Holley Henderson  
January 5, 2010, 6:26 am  
PO Box 7189  
Atlanta, Georgia 30357

This is in regard to GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52, preserving the Open Internet:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional phone and cable companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

monty henderson  
January 5, 2010, 6:29 am  
6175 El Paso Road  
Caldwell, Idaho 83607

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

Francis Hennessey  
January 5, 2010, 6:31 am  
6290 Brierly Creek Rd.  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45247

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Where do you get the idea that the govt. can regulate the internet successfully? The govt. can't regulate itself effectively.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Pat and Dan Hennessey  
January 5, 2010, 6:32 am  
300 Camp Hill Road  
Ft Washington, Pennsylvania 19034

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Donald Hennig  
January 5, 2010, 6:33 am  
5828 N. Lindenwood Dr.,  
Peoria, Illinois 61615

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I should also point out that the FCC does not have the Constitutional authority to regulate the internet.

Keep the internet free, open and unregulated.

Thank you.

Donald Hennig, Ph.D.  
January 5, 2010, 6:38 am  
3011 Green River Rd.  
Henderson, Kentucky 42420

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Harold Heno III  
January 5, 2010, 6:40 am  
314 Mountain Road  
Cornwall-on-Hudson, New York 12520

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

It is my opinion that any action which would limit or control internet usage an development is an illegal use of power by an unelected government bureaucracy. This action should be debated by the people's elected representatives, and ultimately by a full majority of the 50 states.

Don Henry  
January 5, 2010, 6:40 am  
2421 Chimney Hill Ct.  
Edmond, Oklahoma 73034

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Is there NO LIMIT to Washington's abuses in regulating Americans' lives? DO NOT REGULATE THE INTERNET! There exists no LEGITIMATE justification for the federal government to intrude on Internet activities. You have only your own fabrications for wanting to exercise control over the Internet. Even the name "OPEN INTERNET" is misleading and dishonest as to your intentions. This is only more of the same underhanded manipulation by the Obama administration to intrude in the day-to-day lives of all Americans. Your day of reckoning as power-mongering, worthless bureaucrats will come!

Bill Hensley  
January 5, 2010, 6:42 am  
1810 Riverbend Crossing  
Sugar Land, Texas 77478

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The last thing we need is more government regulation.

William Herder  
January 5, 2010, 6:43 am  
16794 Logans Lake Road  
Boonville, Missouri 65233

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Cheryl Herring  
January 5, 2010, 6:44 am  
330 E. Glenhurst Dr.  
Oro Valley, Arizona 85704

I am taking a stand against more government take over of free communication in this country. The 'net-neutrality' is just another way for the government/liberals to take away more of our freedom of speech/communication rights.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ronald Herring  
January 5, 2010, 6:51 am  
9353 Brandon Lane  
Miles, Texas 76861

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Kathryn Herty  
January 5, 2010, 6:52 am  
6329 Miller Drive  
Alexandria, Virginia 22315

As an Americans for Prosperity activist (which means I am standing up for what is right as is my RIGHT per the united States CONSTITUTION- the CONSTITUTION clearly limits government control and gives me, a loyal United States citizen, the right to make my voice heard), I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Also, we see how government control of the internet and communications works in China- a Communist country. I do NOT want government interfering in my right to receive/transmit information via the internet, especially using MY TAX DOLLARS!!!! If you do not like freedom of speech or freedom in general, go to China. I am sure they would appreciate your efforts.

Dean Hess  
January 5, 2010, 6:53 am  
2848 Clearview Road  
Aliison Park, Pennsylvania 15101

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

JUST STAY OUT OF LIVES!



Nola Hiatt  
January 5, 2010, 6:53 am  
3301 Jacobs Dr.  
McKinney, Texas 75070

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Please stay out of regulating the Internet. Leave it alone.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Judy Hile  
January 5, 2010, 6:54 am  
98-1970 Kaahumanu  
Pearl City, Hawaii 96782

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated publicly in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Gloria Hill  
January 5, 2010, 6:55 am  
1091 Woodall Dairy Road  
Benson, North Carolina 27504

We do not need more government control in our lives. As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Suzanne Hill  
January 5, 2010, 7:00 am  
7333 Oakwood Glen  
Spring, Texas 77379

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am sick of this constact freedom grab from our citizens. Stay a way from the internet!!!!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mark Hillen  
January 5, 2010, 7:00 am  
7536 - 5550 Road  
Olathe, Colorado 81425

I am totally opposed to internet regulation. This is ONLY another government attempt to tax the people and regulate our lives.

STOP this insane notion immediately.

Mark Hillen  
Olathe, CO

Lance M Hillier Sr  
January 5, 2010, 7:02 am  
1125 North Travis Street  
De Leon, Texas 76444

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously, it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I also remember the head of the Patent Office wanted to close Patents in the 1890's because "anything of value has been invented already." Typical government bureaucratic short-sightedness that stymies growth and opportunity. And we don't need the government doing this for free expression of data, information, ideas and thought, and the expression thereof.

Sincerely,  
Lance M Hillier Sr  
De Leon, TX

philip hilliker  
January 5, 2010, 7:05 am  
1429 w. rockwood dr.  
phoenix, Arizona 85027

eeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeeAs an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Tama Hinckley  
January 5, 2010, 7:06 am  
14546 Pine View Road  
Larkspur, Colorado 80118

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Petra Hinterschied  
January 5, 2010, 7:09 am  
921 s. hempstead road  
westerville, Ohio 43081

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am sick and tired of the increasing government controls. Government has no business controlling the internet. I don't want to see the US becoming like China and other communist countries, where the Government interferes with freedom of speech and expression on the internet.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

George Hobbes  
January 5, 2010, 7:10 am  
104 Maestas Rd  
Belen, New Mexico 87002

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Cristine Hoche  
January 5, 2010, 7:11 am  
P.O. Box 23313  
Glade Park, Colorado 81523

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Stop trying to control every aspect of our lives.

Shelah Hockman  
January 5, 2010, 7:12 am  
705 Campbell Drive  
Owosso, Michigan 48867

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I think the internet is one of the most positive things to happen recently. People are communicating across boundaries not thought possible 10 years ago. The FCC has enough laws already to enforce. Let the people on the internet regulate themselves what they see.

Connie Hodgdon  
January 5, 2010, 7:13 am  
1141 Forest Drive  
Wooster, Ohio 44691

I am concerned that the Commission is contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. This is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Karin Hodyl  
January 5, 2010, 7:13 am  
2655 Appaloosa Trail  
Palm Harbor, Florida 34685

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

William and Mary Hoffken  
January 5, 2010, 7:13 am  
31357 Nocks Landing Road  
Atlantic, Virginia 23303

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We are totally against net neutrality.

Fred Hofstra  
January 5, 2010, 7:17 am  
122 S. Rusch Rd  
Traverse City, Michigan 49686

Sir or madam:

Please do not restrict the freedom of the Internet with government agendas and meddling. It is important for the Internet to remain free, and managed by the companies that know it best, rather than by government, particularly with the latter's political agendas.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



DON HOLDEN  
January 5, 2010, 7:19 am  
726 CHANDLER ROAD  
GURNEE, Illinois 60031

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

LET THE INTERNET CONTINUE AS IS IN PRIVATE HANDS AND DEVELOPMENT.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Pamela Holdren  
January 5, 2010, 7:20 am  
269 East Schantz Avenue  
Dayton, Ohio 45409

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

**DON'T TREAD ON THE AMERICAN PEOPLE!**

Chaz Holland  
January 5, 2010, 7:21 am  
1522 Sadlers Wells Dr  
Herndon, Virginia 20170

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Freedom of speech is the issue. Government control places that fundamental right in jeopardy. I am therefore opposed to government control of the internet.

David Hollingsworth  
January 5, 2010, 7:22 am  
3306 Brookhill Circle  
Lexington, Kentucky 40502

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The internet is working just fine. We do not need to have the government involved. The free market is working well. If the government gets involved it will cost tax payers money and limit speech.

Bonnie Holloway  
January 5, 2010, 7:24 am  
1921 Chipeta Ct  
Grand Junction, Colorado 81501

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am opposed to the government taking control of the internet. The restrictions would again hamper small businesses that utilize internet.

Edwin H. Holloway  
January 5, 2010, 7:25 am  
503 CORUM RD  
EXCELSIOR SPRINGS, Missouri 64024-3016

As an American citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jerry Holm  
January 5, 2010, 7:26 am  
P.O. Box 1406  
Freeland, Washington 98249

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In short leave well enough alone. Do not open the door to government ownership with the attendant restrictions and oppressions sure to follow.

J Lorimer Holm, M.D.  
January 5, 2010, 7:26 am  
1276 East Rd -- Berlin  
Barre, Vermont 5641

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The "net" works well, "reform" is unnecessary -- and almost certainly would politicize it to its great detriment.



ovid Holmes  
January 5, 2010, 7:27 am  
PO BOX 19  
PO BOX 19  
Port Costa, California 94569

The proposed new internet regulations are anti-freedom, anti-American, pro-control, and the spawn of those who wish to have a controlled society.

Bob Holt  
January 5, 2010, 7:27 am  
7446 East 53rd Place  
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74145

Keep the internet and Free Speech, FREE !! The internet should enjoy freedom of press and free speech

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Bob Holy  
January 5, 2010, 7:28 am  
861 Seibles Rd  
Montgomery, Alabama 36116

The government cannot run Washington so leave the internet alone!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

David Hooper  
January 5, 2010, 7:28 am  
393 Cypress Creek Dr.  
Mt. Vernon, Texas 75457

Leave the internet alone. It is working quite well without government intervention. No government control is needed or wanted by the users of the internet.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Raymond Hoppes  
January 5, 2010, 7:29 am  
2438 Craycroft Drive  
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80920

For your review I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I believe the Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

I think the envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Richard Horan  
January 5, 2010, 7:29 am  
Box 627  
Cortland Road  
Davis, West Virginia 26260-0627

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Don't interfere wiht the freedom of the internet. Proposals for "net neutrality" or an "open internet" will damage the internet. Hands off please. Keep Washington and its regulations out of our internet. At the very least, this is a matter that should be handled in Congress, not imposed on us by an unrepresentative bureaucracy like the FCC. Thank you.

William Frank Horan  
January 5, 2010, 7:29 am  
1 Jean Street  
Marshall Village  
Middletown, Rhode Island 02842-4536

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

"I ( am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

"Last, in my opinion (William F Horan) the internet now serves even beyond the important roles of facilitating modern commerce and communications of all kinds both domestic and international. Yes, internet now a key tool & role in citizens defending and protection of our constitutional Republic with a representative democracy.

The agenda before us is rather simple; the internet must remain a tool and even weapon in the citizens Arsenal' in a defense of our Constitutional Republic. Or will the internet be allowed to continue morphing into a weapon for the arsenal of darkness & evil that is a clear and present danger committed to a rapid destruction of our constitutional republic as we know it?

Yes, the Liberty Pole of our founding fathers. The Liberty Pole where the body politic of the peoples government was discussed that ultimately realizes an informed electorate (one of the first defenses of our country and its Constitution and Bill of Rights).

Yes, today our internet is "The electronic Liberty Pole" for citizens of all walks of life across our great nation. Yes, like the liberty pole of every village, town, county, city of our country as it must once again configure for the 21 century challenges and renewal of our country.

The internet is as well a major element in contributing to the required critical scrutiny and subsequent homogenizing of ideas of the body politic as ultimately reflected in a prosperity of our country.

As such the internet now services the role of information transactions and data depository access to our citizens and facilitates the independent exchange of opinion, idea and thought of the citizen (these all elements of adult learning and companion

critical thinking). Such contributes to the core competency and capability of an informed electorate to their active participation in the business of our Constitutional republic.

Accordingly today the internet is a very necessary and critical tool for the individual and collective citizens to exercise due diligence in the protection and defense of their country and its constitution from any and all clear and present dangers.

The internet is a citizen's tool in the duty of performing due diligences in a monitoring and communications of their chosen and elected government officials. Yes, officials with defined - very specific and limited boundaries. Yes, boundaries having been set forth (role and responsibility) to govern a free and independent people (for and by the people)..

Those dangers could range from both domestic and international evil, incompetence, corruption or on occasion even the people's government gone rogue from the boundaries as specified in the US Constitution (will of the people).

As such subjecting the internet to a rogue government no longer subscribing to the constitution and the people's will (or a like private cabol) will enable obstruction. Yes, obstruction in the form of a censorship or interference of any and all kinds and or restricting access, use or content. I maintain that such behaviors for any reason is a violation of freedom of speech & totally unacceptable. I would offer that such a confluence of events as just outlined would constitute a clear and present danger to our Constitutional Republic.

I might observe that today we have already experienced the attack of rogue elements on the internet including; altering scrubbing and even removing information for whatever reason with an avalanche of companion outright propaganda and untruths. The role of Federal Government today and its extent of participation in such and companion less than full application of existing law is very troubling.

I might observe that today we see what appears to be a few cartels (domestic and international) concentrating & controlling news sources and its content to the people via both print and electronic media. Yes, where open and timely flow of contrasting ideas has been severely limited and outright interfered with e.g. de facto censorship and "planting of propaganda memes". As such the internet has become an even much more critical citizens source of information and ideas from any and all vantage points. These components formulate a timely feeding the Arsenal of ideas that ultimately defends our --- freedom liberty and sovereignty of a constitutional republic.

While it is the citizens duty and obligation to sort out the internet or other sources components of wheat from the chafe no one individual, group, or even elements of government has the right to interfere and obstruct this process to the extent we have experienced especially since the 2008 election cycle forward.

The internet is today a critical tool in the arsenal of democracy. Yes, the citizens' first last and ultimate defense of our US Constitution, Bill of Rights & continued freedom liberty and sovereignty of a free and independent people.

I view anything less than a free and open internet as a choice made to utilize the internet as a weapon against this country and its people for the deliberate slide into the abyss of those extremes fostered by both domestic and international evil committed to the destruction of our country as we know it.

Yes, an evil force bent on the destruction of our constitutional republic as we know it and redistribution - plunder of our wealth into the shared misery of socialism.

Such behavior I suggest a manipulation by the dark side evils; including that of a transition of our government and society to a Marxism, fascism and National Socialism.

Yes, all well know dangers to a free people and the American way of life that has secured an abundance to society via independence of thought, idea, opinion, and the individual pursuit of one's agenda and (not a guaranteed -regulated outcome) freedom liberty and a national sovereignty.

The internet must remain a tool and even weapon in the citizens Arsenal' in a defense of our Constitutional Republic? Or will the internet be allowed to continue morphing into a weapon from the arsenal of darkness & evil that is a clear and present danger committed to of a rapid destruction of our constitutional republic as we know it.

The citizens have continued to monitor their government and its transactions impart via the internet. I suggest that today we have concluded that we are already suffering from both domestic and international evils interference in the people's business e.g. the deliberations and transactions of our government.. Yes, an assault on our country and way of life. Today we have a clear and present danger and the citizens are already in the process of addressing this assault on their country and freedom liberty and national sovereignty.



William F Horan Citizen  
Middletown, RI

Judith Horn  
January 5, 2010, 7:31 am  
6365 Melia St.  
Simi Valley, California 93063

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This is nothing more than another " power grab " by Washington, and the people are tired of being told the Government can run thing's better than private company's, what a laugh that is. Stop trying to control every aspect of our live's !!!!

Judith Horn  
January 5, 2010, 7:32 am  
6365 Melia St.  
6365 Melia St.  
Simi Valley, California 93063

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I strongly send a NO vote on this proposal

kerry horoho  
January 5, 2010, 7:35 am  
12540 South  
state road 19  
Converse, Indiana 46919

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

kh

elizabeth houghton  
January 5, 2010, 7:35 am  
6222 rosemary drive  
cypress, California 90630

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

ALL OF YOU THERE IN DC SIMPLY CANNOT PULL THE RUG OUT FROM UNDER EVERY CITIZEN OF OUR NATION AND ROB US OF OUR FREEDOMS, A LA MAO TSE TUNG!

Mark Houghton  
January 5, 2010, 7:40 am  
201 Albers Road  
Bronson, Michigan 49028

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

keith howard  
January 5, 2010, 7:41 am  
7 dewey street  
hampden, Maine 4444

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

please keep the internet free

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

wix howard  
January 5, 2010, 7:41 am  
241 Kelsey Place  
Castle Rock, Colorado 80104

Re: Preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52

Please do not move to the open Internet policy. In fact, please leave it alone. We do not need more government intervention.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



DAVID HOWARTH  
January 5, 2010, 7:42 am  
1213 WESTGLEN DR  
SACHSE, Texas 75048

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please leave the public some form of communication, preferably the Internet free from unelected, unresponsive bureaucratic control!!!

Janet Howell  
January 5, 2010, 7:46 am  
5011 E Moores Creek Rd  
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive and the free market is working well. Phone, cable and satellite companies are competing to win customers, and now wireless companies have entered into the competition. I have many choices. If government controlled the internet, there would be no choice.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and almost certainly be economically impractical. It seems designed to engineer and economic downfall of the internet which would then require a government "bailout", caused not because the industry was unable to sustain itself, but because it could not survive foolish regulations.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Rex Howell  
January 5, 2010, 7:49 am  
3003 Forest Dr.  
Cheyenne, Wyoming 82001

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I realize that this is form letter but, I agree with it completely

Rex Howell

Hope A Hoyt  
January 5, 2010, 7:49 am  
1573 Mayline Court  
Hickory, North Carolina 28601

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

It is time for the government to stop invading and imposing on our lives. Time for the government to stay out of my life.

Shin Hsu  
January 5, 2010, 7:49 am  
15 Rollis Place  
Laguna Niguel, California 92677

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

C L Huddleston  
January 5, 2010, 7:50 am  
2710 Crafton Park  
Upper Arlington, Ohio 43221

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is bringing light into the darkest areas of the world. It is the most powerful technological tool combatting totalitarianism and oppression ... a role once played by radio, and later television, until oppressive governments learned to seize control of electronic communications. The internet will soon have been responsible for the overturn of radical Islamic leadership in Iran, and of other totalitarian regimes in Africa, Asia and the Americas.

Former United States Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes argued eloquently for free speech in *Abrams v. United States*: "Persecution for the expression of opinions seems to me perfectly logical. If you have no doubt of your premises or your power and want a certain result with all your heart you naturally express your wishes in law and sweep away all opposition...But when men have realized that time has upset many fighting faiths, they may come to believe even more than they believe the very foundations of their own conduct that the ultimate good desired is better reached by free trade in ideas...that the best test of truth is the power of the thought to get itself accepted in the competition of the market, and that truth is the only ground upon which their wishes safely can be carried out. That at any rate is the theory of our Constitution."

Holmes later termed free speech the "reverberating clang of ideas in the marketplace." There is no concept more essential to individual freedom and liberty ... in Africa, Afghanistan or America.

The first act of any modern dictator--Nazis and Facists and Maoists and other "Freedom Fighters", that is, those who fight against Freedom--has been to seize control of electronic communications technology.

Taxes and taxpayer subsidies on the internet would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

-- C L Huddleston  
Columbus, Ohio

Mark Hudson  
January 5, 2010, 7:52 am  
1031 Jubilee apt A  
Pahrump, Nevada 89048

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Today a word means the opposite of what you find in the dictionary. Was is Peace, Freedom is Control by the Government that is meant to Serve the citizens of this country. Transparent government is a secretive government. Fairness is preference given to one political ideal over another. The government needs to do what it does best. When I figure out what that is I will let you know. Until then hands off!

Janet Hughes  
January 5, 2010, 7:53 am  
PO Box 397  
Brookings, Oregon 97415

-

The internet as it is today is an international storefront of many countries voices and products. How can one nation take control and regulate it. It belongs and is part of all the people of the world. Therefore we [US} or any other nation can not



Catherine Huisman  
January 5, 2010, 7:53 am  
127 W 5th St.  
Red Wing, Minnesota 55066

This is not the American way, this takes away freedom and the Open Internet must be stopped!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Donald Hume  
January 5, 2010, 7:54 am  
18305 Lake Harbor Lane  
Prairieville, Louisiana 70769

As an American interested in preserving our liberties and keeping more government out of our lives, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Maggie Hunt  
January 5, 2010, 7:55 am  
7909 Princess View Dr  
santee, California 92071

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

**STAY OUT OF OUR LIVES AND OFF THE NET!!!**

Terry Hunt  
January 5, 2010, 7:55 am  
5347 williamson st  
clarkston, Michigan 48346

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This is just another liberty you want to take away! NO!!!

Craig Hunter  
January 5, 2010, 7:55 am  
534 Bristol Avenue  
Simi Valley, California 93065

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Craig H. Hunter

Gregory Hunter  
January 5, 2010, 7:57 am  
974 Allison Avenue  
St. Helena, California 94574-1304

As an Americans for Prosperity activist I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Instead, the FCC should be utilizing its powers to push full steam ahead with facilitating extension of Internet access to unserved and undeserved rural areas of our vast nation. The digital divide includes the U.S. hinterlands.

Thank you for your serious consideration of my concerns.

Sincerely,

Gregory Lane Hunter

Charles Hursh  
January 5, 2010, 7:57 am  
1004 Donald Drive  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17111

AS an outraged citizen tired of government control and intervention into virtually every aspect of my life, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Rodney Hurtuk  
January 5, 2010, 7:58 am  
76 Tolland Grn  
Tolland, Connecticut 6084

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am particularly concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Lee Hutchison  
January 5, 2010, 7:58 am  
2232 Arnold Drive  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28205

NO TO INTRUSIVE GOVERNMENT TAKE OVER OF INTERNET COMMUNICATIONS...WE ARE A FREE REPUBLIC...NOT A FASCIST STATE...CEASE AND DESIST THIS REGULATORY ACTION NOW...THERE IS NO DEMONSTRABLE EVIDENCE WARRANTING THIS ACTION...

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Wendy Ihms  
January 5, 2010, 7:58 am  
820 E. Encinas Ae.  
Gilbert, Arizona 85234

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Please do not allow for the government to force new regulations on internet which may interfere with private investment, causing government take over and increased taxpayer expenses.

Thank you,  
Wendy

Al Ikenberg  
January 5, 2010, 7:59 am  
9 Oak Glade Ct  
Savannah, Georgia 31411

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Donald Imbimbo  
January 5, 2010, 8:02 am  
PO Box 9  
Mansfield, Pennsylvania 16933

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,

Don Imbimbo  
Computer Specialist

Karl Imdorf  
January 5, 2010, 8:03 am  
5319 Hoffman Dr S  
Schnecksville, Pennsylvania 18078

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

THE INTERNET HAS DEVELOPED JUST FINE WITHOUT GOVERNMENT REGULATION. THERE IS NO NEED FOR IT NOW AS IT IS EXTREMELY COMPETITIVE. AS A BUSINESS PERSON I HAVE ENJOYED COSTS GOING DOWN OVER THE LAST 10 YEARS. IF GOVERNMENT STAYS OUT CAN ENVISION THEM GOING EVEN LOWER.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

BOBBIE INGLE  
January 5, 2010, 8:03 am  
1320 BISCAYNE RD  
ROANOKE, Virginia 24019

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Is there anyway to stop the government TAKEOVER of everything ?

Raymond Iorio  
January 5, 2010, 8:05 am  
2206 SE Stonehaven Rd.  
Port St. Lucie, Florida 34952

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. I firmly believe that even Congress should not be involved in determining the future of the Internet, left alone the system is working now. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. This is just another CONTROL over the free will of the people that the obama administration wants to put in place. The people have been pushed up against a wall as it is, this will only add more fuel to the fire of outrage that is burning now.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Brian Irving  
January 5, 2010, 8:07 am  
206 Clancy Circle  
Cary, North Carolina 27511

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The Internet and the world wide web are the last vestiges of free press existing in America. Keep the free press free. Keep your hands off the internet.



douglas ivari  
January 5, 2010, 8:09 am  
109 sweetgum drive  
troy, Missouri 63379

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The internet is for everyone, is global, and has existed very well without government control. Access and content have been primary issues, but privacy filters, obscenity filters, and virus programming have managed these without government intervention. There is no need for the government to start skimming now. Hands off my internet!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

GARY JACKSON  
January 5, 2010, 8:09 am  
17336 FOUNDERS MILL DRIVE  
DERWOOD, Maryland 20855

RE: GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52 regarding the "Internet"

As a private U.S. citizen and Americans for Prosperity activist, I submit the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

BASICALLY:

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT MUST KEEP HANDS OFF THE UNCENSORED AND UNFETTERED STORAGE AND TRANSMISSION OF OF IDEAS AND INFORMATION AND EXPRESSION/SPEECH ON THE INTERNET - especially political speech!

WE WANT : NO QUOTAS, NO "BALANCE," NO "DIVERSITY," NO "HATE SPEECH PROHIBITION," NO CENSORSHIP, NO "BALANCE", NO "GUIDANCE," NO "FAIRNESS," NO "REPRESENTATION OF THE UNDERREPRESENTED", ETC, ETC

NO NOTHIN' !!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jack Jackson  
January 5, 2010, 8:09 am  
504 Libety  
Batavia, Iowa 52533

Dear FCC Official,

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James Jackson  
January 5, 2010, 8:10 am  
12612 N. Skiles Ave.  
Kansas City, Missouri 64167

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Holly Jacobs  
January 5, 2010, 8:12 am  
32536 State Hwy 129  
New Camria, Missouri 63558

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

DOESNT THE GOVERNMENT HAVE THIER NOSES AND HANDS STUCK INTO PRIVATE AFFAIRS AND PRIVATE POCKETS::: ENOUGH ALREADY !!! T. E. A. GOVERNMENT IS GETTING WAY WAY TO BIG !!!!! JUST amother way for the government to try and control private sectors and take more income from american people.

mark jacobs  
January 5, 2010, 8:13 am  
2531 sunny ln  
wichita, Kansas 67205

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE!

Douglas Jacobsma  
January 5, 2010, 8:13 am  
PO Box 188  
Doon, Iowa 51235

Does the government really need to regulate and control yet another industry ?

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jerome Jacobsmeyer  
January 5, 2010, 8:13 am  
6767 Eichelberger St.  
St. Louis, Missouri 63109-3315

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

NO to any government monitoring of the internet. HANDS OFF my internet !



Barbara Jacques  
January 5, 2010, 8:15 am  
2745 Meadow Park Ave.  
Henderson, Nevada 89052

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

Louis Jahn  
January 5, 2010, 8:19 am  
12979 Beacon Cove Lane  
Fort Myers, Florida 33919

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Far more than the telephone industry where mergers have rejoined AT&T except it left two other similar monopolies! Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Donn Jakosky  
January 5, 2010, 8:20 am  
5764 Green Meadow Dr.  
Agoura Hills, California 91301

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

r. janes  
January 5, 2010, 8:21 am  
w234 s4835 mill creek  
waukesha, Wisconsin 53189

This bill seems like what they have in China, Cuba, Iran. and Venuezuela. Why would an American government want this kind of control too??? Odd, wouldn't you say.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

John H Jarvis  
January 5, 2010, 8:22 am  
5440 E Calle del Medio  
Phoenix, Arizona 85018

The first amendment to the U.S. Constitution states that Congress shall make no law that abridges the freedom of speech. I should think that the spirit of this prohibition would extend to the Executive branch of Government so that no the Executive branch would not act to control or abridge the freedom of speech expressed by and through the internet.

Adherence to and respect for the Constitution is absolutely essential for the survival and vitality of this great country. Any action by government that asserts selective control of the freedom of speech and/or of the press would be in violation of the Constitution and be a step toward tyranny.

I firmly oppose any governmental control of the the use of the internet by means of so-called "net neutrality" or whatever similar term or idea.

L. Dale Jefferson  
January 5, 2010, 8:24 am  
11707 Twin Oaks Dr.  
Berlin, Maryland 21811

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I have read this submission and support its content and meaning.

John and Carol Jeffries  
January 5, 2010, 8:24 am  
307 South Arch Street  
Carterville, Missouri 64835

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Such action will inevitably lead to dire consequences. As a student of history and trends, the American spirit will not tolerate further moves toward a totalitarian state. This is not Germany of the 1930s, post-Tzarist Russia, Pol Pot Cambodia (or a long list of consistently failed socialist “utopias.” A line has been drawn and already crossed over: NOT IN OUR COUNTRY, YOU DON'T!

Lloyd Jennings  
January 5, 2010, 8:25 am  
678 Chelsea Drive  
Sanford, North Carolina 27332

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am tired of government takeovers. The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Mark Jensen  
January 5, 2010, 8:26 am  
1514 H St  
Modesto, Colorado 95354

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In summary, the system is not broken and does not need fixing by you or any other government agency.

Scott Jensen  
January 5, 2010, 8:26 am  
24311 Little Trout Valley Road  
Winona, Minnesota 55987-5828

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,

Scott Jensen

Kevin Jermyn  
January 5, 2010, 8:27 am  
12 Pearl Street  
Auburn, Massachusetts 1501

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

In addition, Washington has proven itself to be financially irresponsible, wasteful and wantonly destructive. In regard to laws, Washington has shown itself to be willingly ignorant of, incapable of following, and unabashedly defiant of the laws they themselves create. They have also shown a complete disregard or no knowledge or understanding of the burdens that these laws have on the taxpaying citizens and businesses of the US. Washington must have no more power than what it is granted by the US Constitution. Currently, Washington has abused its power and should be treated as a domestic enemy of the United States for its treasonous acts of willful destruction of the US economy, (cap and trade, carbon tax designed to cripple and steal from an economy that is trillions of dollars in debt) its takeover of private businesses, (auto industry, banking industry, health care industry, insurance industry) over-taxation of its citizens and businesses. No more should the people of the US be victims of intimidation, over-regulation, corruption of government, over-taxation and the Washington “let them eat cake” mentality of corrupt over-paid multi-millionaires who have no clue as to what it is really like to struggle in America today.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

doris jesseme  
January 5, 2010, 8:27 am  
1205 formosa ave.  
west hollywood, California 90027

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We dont want any interference from the Feds with our internet. Leave us alone...will you. butt out...

Clement Jessica  
January 5, 2010, 8:27 am  
4511 Cathedral Ave NW  
Washington, District of Columbia 200016

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

jktadoc jktadoc

January 5, 2010, 8:28 am

vlygsw@faotgl.com

vlygsw@faotgl.com

wWJYdVbFLPLlrl, Tennessee l2CNvl <a href="http://fvcyoyiowpmy.com/">fvcyoyiowpmy</a>, [url=http://hlosfeczhcqr.com/]hlosfeczhcqr[/url], [link=http://kege

l2CNvl <a href="http://fvcyoyiowpmy.com/">fvcyoyiowpmy</a>, [url=http://hlosfeczhcqr.com/]hlosfeczhcqr[/url], [link=http://kegeazdabhlt.com/]kegeazdabhlt[/link], http://evlxxgcwqdi.com/

Wendelyn Johannes  
January 5, 2010, 8:29 am  
13 Bayview Blvd  
Ft. Myers Beach  
Fl, Florida 33931

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Wennie Johannes

Ann Johnson  
January 5, 2010, 8:30 am  
154 Wyndham Hill Rd  
Middletown, Rhode Island 2842

Do you really want to stop the next Google or Yahoo or Twitter? Just don't do this silly, silly and subversive takeover of the Internet.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Cheryl Johnson  
January 5, 2010, 8:32 am  
2803 Newnan Ridge Court  
Oak Hill, Virginia 20171

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Once again, the government is trying to intervene in the private sector and reduce the autonomy that allows free market enterprise to thrive, create jobs and provide the engine that allows that government to exist. You government officials forget, far too often, who you work for. It is MY money that pays your salary and so yes, I have a say in how you conduct business. It is not the other way around. The government does not provide me with anything that I do not pay for in one way or another. You work for me, millions of other American people and American companies and if you don't quit inserting yourself in places where you don't belong WE WILL FIRE YOU!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Eric Johnson  
January 5, 2010, 8:33 am  
1202 Cardinal St  
Bangor, Wisconsin 54614

As an American, I do not want the government taking over the internet and filtering what it approves and disapproves according to the left wing liberal socialist agenda. In the future I do not want to see America turn out how China uses its government to filter out Christian websites. This would completely abolish our American freedom of speech, religion, and separation of church and state.

Jessie Johnson  
January 5, 2010, 8:34 am  
1115 Edgewood ave S  
646  
Jacksonville, Florida 32205

As a 912 Organizer, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Kevin Johnson  
January 5, 2010, 8:36 am  
512 David Ct  
Platteville, Colorado 80651

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Can you show me your authority to do this in the Constitution?

Sarah Johnson  
January 5, 2010, 8:37 am  
2004 Red Forest rd  
Greensboro, North Carolina 27410

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive and that leads to innovation. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. This proposal will cause businesses that are currently thriving on the Internet uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity, and cause more job losses. I have a friend who creates web ads that would not have a job because of the intrusion of government regulations that these investments would no longer make economic sense.

Transforming the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Constitution does not allow the Commission to require these intrusive regulatory changes.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, I ask you to reject new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Silvan Johnson  
January 5, 2010, 8:38 am  
691 Maple Avenue  
Fulton, New York 13069

As an Americans citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Stephanie Johnson  
January 5, 2010, 8:38 am  
11702 Pleasant Ridge Ct.  
Apt. 116  
Little Rock, Arkansas 72223

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I thought we still lived in a free country. Or did this cease to exist when Obama was inaugurated and chose to turn this Republican into a Communist nation. Let me remind you that the Communist Soviet Union leadership also had plenty of czars.

William Johnson  
January 5, 2010, 8:40 am  
5809 Alberta Street  
Bakersfield, California 93304

As an American for free speech as guaranteed under the first amendment to the constitution of the United States of America, I am submitting the following comments regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford, a socialist (see communist) and Free Press founder Robert McChesney (the same).

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

As mentioned in the first sentence of this comment, any attempt by congress or any bureaucracy to limit our free speech rights is unconstitutional in every respect and is not conducive to freedom of any sort, rather it smacks of communism and fascism in the vein of Lenin, Mao, Stalin, Hitler and Mussolini. Any further attempt to foist such a policy upon the American people will only serve to lessen or eliminate the already dangerously low trust the public has in this administration. Once the elections are held in November 2010, if this policy has been implemented, the President will be impeached shortly thereafter!!!!



David Johnston  
January 5, 2010, 8:41 am  
po box 40  
Bloomfield, Kentucky 40008

Government regulation in general breeds inefficiency. It adds an extra hurdle to business trying to inovate and thrive. The internet is one of the most vibrant and expressive business undertakings that have ever graced the planet. It facilitates the flow of ideas and cross references oportunities and technologies in ways that have accellerated the rate of advance of civilization and allowed people who never had an inkling of what the rest of the world was like a window to view that world and a wind of change for the better.

"Net nueutrality" will shutter that window by letting a third party decide what is "right" and "allowable" for the world to view. It will still the winds that fan the flame of inovation. Our nation and the planet are on the verge of some very momentus cliffs from global warming to over population. Is now a good time to shut down the free flow of information and stifle the minds that could find the answers to fix these problems??? I think that that would be disaterous.

I ask you to vote down the new "net neutrality" mandates and let the net continue to flourish.

David Johnston  
January 5, 2010, 8:41 am  
P. O. BOX 1457  
TULARE, California 93275

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If "our" ever more controlling government exercises control over the Internet, it would be a marxist fiasco.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent economically efficient business models. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should not be allowed to happen. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. In fact I believe this would be unconstitutional!

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jan Johnston  
January 5, 2010, 8:42 am  
6 Wistful Vista Place  
The Woodlands, Texas 77382

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

You guys are just putting another mask on the face of your insidious desire to control the freedoms of American citizens. Are you so insecure that you need to hogtie the hands of great innovators and the American spirit of advancing technologies? It is so obvious to the American people that the same motivation in private industry that creates greedy leaders is the same motivation in our government. You are no better than Bernie Maddoff.

Get your stinky, bloody hands off our freedoms!

It is obviously a power grab on your part to tax the living daylights out of the people YOU should be serving. This is not service, its slavery.

NO! To your ideas, your desires, your control, your impotent and self-serving so-called leadership...get your hands off!

STOP! Molesting of our freedoms. Let private industry fail or succeed. Let capitalism do what it has successfully done for over 200 years. Grow! Innovate! Discover! Advance!

The government has never ever shown the ability to do what private industry and citizens have done in advancing technologies--even technologies that feed other nations!! The government only rides on the backs of private industry and takes the credit.

Under your restrictive meddling innovation will die. What are you going to do when the very technologies you feed off of die and you have nothing to control, nothing to tax? BACK OFF! You don't know how to run anything all you do is write laws to your advantage.

Patricia Johnston  
January 5, 2010, 8:42 am  
2144 Forrest Pl  
Atlanta, Georgia 30318

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,  
Patricia Johnston

Joan Jolliffe  
January 5, 2010, 8:42 am  
3144 Seven Lakes West  
Seven Lakes, North Carolina 27376

I am opposed to the "Open Network" ruling currently being considered by the FCC. I do not believe the government should impose new regulations to restrict internet content.

Anne Marie Jones  
January 5, 2010, 8:43 am  
2221 Dillard Crossing  
Tucker, Georgia 30084

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,

Anne Marie Jones

Carie Jones  
January 5, 2010, 8:43 am  
2120 Montana Ave.  
Santa Monica, California 90403

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Christin Jones  
January 5, 2010, 8:44 am  
800 W. Sam Houston Pkwy.  
Houston, Texas 77042

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The use of the internet is key to my children doing school projects and their homework. It is also the way I purchase needed items for my home and family. I also keep in touch with my family via e-mail as they all live far away. We use the internet to print maps of destinations in and out of the area and find places and prices for food, clothes, home furnishings, toys and cars. The internet belongs in the hands of private American companies that know how to run businesses NOT the government...ever.



GLEN JONES  
January 5, 2010, 8:45 am  
4541 PRINCE CT NE  
SALEM, Oregon 97305

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

thank you glen jones

Pam Jones  
January 5, 2010, 8:46 am  
2938 N. Canyon Rd.  
Provo, Utah 84604

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Keep the government out of the internet!

paul jones  
January 5, 2010, 8:49 am  
d c drive  
abindon, Maryland 21099

NO FEDERAL MUZZLING OF THE INTERNET.

NET NEUTRALITY REPRESSES FREEDOM OF SPEECH.

IT IS CONSTITUTIONALLY ILLEGAL. GET OUT!!!!!!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sara Jones  
January 5, 2010, 8:50 am  
9939 S. Congress Street6  
New Market, Virginia 22844

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We have had a Czar of this department and a Czar of that department, which has only resulted in more government control. As I was growing up, my parents constantly educated me about the "free" country in which we were living, a democratic country where everyone had a voice. In today's times it appears that we are no longer democratic, but rather socialistic because the government is controlling everything. The spirit of free enterprise is something of the past. Here comes the Internet Czar!!!

Mary Josey  
January 5, 2010, 8:51 am  
4111 Meadowgold Lane  
Kingwood, Texas 77345

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Judyann Joyner  
January 5, 2010, 8:51 am  
42 Forest Trail  
Ridge, New York 11961

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In essence, hands off our Internet.

John Julian  
January 5, 2010, 8:51 am  
1224 Brookfield Lane  
Mansfield, Texas 76063

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a MISTAKE! It is unnecessary, and the ONLY reason the government would take control over the Internet would be to TAX it! The American people are already being taxed into poverty. The FCC should set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

John Justman  
January 5, 2010, 8:51 am  
1954 K Road  
Fruita, Colorado 81521

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

John Justman



S. K.  
January 5, 2010, 8:52 am  
14 Savona Estates  
Savona, New York 14879

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The government has never run anything well, economically, or efficiently. And, ever since the election of FDR to the presidency we have had more and more unconstitutional things proposed, and, in some cases, even passed illegally into law by socialists in the government. Our country's founders knew that we need less government, not more, and that we need to keep a tight rein on what government we do have. They put that into our Constitution--the law of our land, but that hasn't stopped the socialists from trampling all over it. Stop messing with my country and my Constitution! If you don't like my country--LEAVE! I will help you pack!

Maria Kaczmarek  
January 5, 2010, 8:54 am  
P.O. Box 5396  
Plant City, Florida 33563

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I believe in America and America is based founded on the principals of regulatory restraint, free markets, and private ownership. There is no place for unnecessary government involvement.

Randi Kainz  
January 5, 2010, 8:55 am  
1966 NE Hillaire Dr.  
Hillsboro, Oregon 97124

STOP the out-of-control power grabs and siezing of private business and property.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Hazel Kaletta  
January 5, 2010, 8:57 am  
1100 St Charles Pl, # 808  
Pembroke Pines, Florida 33026

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

WHAT HAPPENED TO FREE SPEECH? IF PEOPLE DO NOT LIKE WHAT SOMEONE IS SAYING ON THE RADIO OR TV, ALL THEY HAVE TO DO IS CHANGE THE STATION OR CHANNEL. DO NOT AND I MEAN DO NOT TAKE AWAY MY FREEDOME TO HEAR WHOMEVER I WISH ON THE RADIO OR TV.....

Mrs. Porter Kallish  
January 5, 2010, 8:57 am  
5460 Los Robles Dr  
Carlsbad, California 92008

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Porter S. Kallish 01 05 2010

Ansim Kalugin  
January 5, 2010, 9:00 am  
552 100th ave  
Bellevue, Washington 98004

Senators, Congressmen, Judges, Executive, HANDS OFF THE INTERNET! You can't even manage correctly the federal budgets, schools, IRS, wars, roads, health care and banks.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Karl H KanALZ  
January 5, 2010, 9:01 am  
5272 County Road 862  
McKinney, Texas 75071

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional telephone and cable companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not, on its own, set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. Further, any "regulation" of the Internet by the FCC raises the question of American's free speech rights and would be a clear violation of our country's constitution.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Derek Kane  
January 5, 2010, 9:01 am  
c/o 1167 NW Wallula Ave apt 248, non-domestic, zip exempt  
Gresham, Oregon 97030tdc

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Leave the internet alone. Restrictions will be viewed by me as a threat to first amendment rights of free speech and free press.



Maurice Kane  
January 5, 2010, 9:02 am  
1772 Avenida Entrada  
San Dimas, California 91773

As someone who accesses the Internet for reasons, professional and private, each and every day, I am interested in preserving the features that have made the Internet the excellent source of knowledge and communication that it has become since the days when it was a Department of Defense project out of UCLA. Therefore, I wish to urge the Federal Communications Commission to maintain the decentralized, free market-oriented, non-governmentally-regulated nature and character of the Internet and to prevent the so-called "open Internet" and "net neutrality" proponents from destroying a great American invention. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

At present, the Internet is a highly competitive realm that has already vastly augmented customer options to viewing television (like the Hulu website), listening to Internet radio, participating in electoral politics (fund-raising, expressing political perspectives, communicating with fellow travelers), conducting research for school and business, personal finance & paying bills, engaging in commerce through on-line purchasing (which I did to a considerable extent during the recently concluded Christmas season). Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Arlene Kapner  
January 5, 2010, 9:02 am  
8313  
Lacey, Washington 98516

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Richard Karas  
January 5, 2010, 9:02 am  
4371 Irene Drive  
Saint Clair, Michigan 48079

As an Americans for Prosperity reader, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Melvin Karsten  
January 5, 2010, 9:04 am  
7117 Lake Vista Drive  
Apt 3A  
Byron Center, Michigan 49315

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I'm suggesting that all of you in Washington that want to have everything controlled by the government, go live in North Korea or China for a couple years before you decide this is a good form of government. You aren't thinking about the American people, just about yourselves and POWER.  
**KNOCK IT OFF!!!**

Steve Kartchner  
January 5, 2010, 9:10 am  
14853 S. Briar Park Road  
Herriman, Utah 84096

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The only regulation I support is control of the pornography industry, particularly child porn, and criminal activity. Otherwise, the internet should remain free.

Barbara Kasmiroski  
January 5, 2010, 9:10 am  
143 Meadowbrook Dr  
Waco, Texas 76706

Keep the internet FREE FROM WASHINGTON D.C!!!!!!

Heidi Kassal  
January 5, 2010, 9:11 am  
22475 E. Hidden Trail Drive  
Parker, Colorado 80138

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ultimately, this is just another example of government regulators overstepping their boundaries. Leave the internet alone.

Heidi Kassal  
January 5, 2010, 9:11 am  
22475 E. Hidden Trail Drive  
Parker, Colorado 80138

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ultimately, this is just another example of government regulators overstepping their boundaries. Leave the internet alone.



Martin Katerberg  
January 5, 2010, 9:14 am  
8340 Wallinwood Springs  
Jenison, Michigan 49428

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

First, let's get one thing clear: Our President said (while recently in China) he is for an open and free of censorship internet....his lips say one thing and his actions do the opposite!!

Second, why don't you start giving these Bills a name that fits what they really are: there's is nothing "open" or "neutral" about this bill.

Frankly, I can not believe we are in ANOTHER position to defend ANOTHER government take-over. What part of OUR Consitution states that government must think for us and control all of our actions? I simply can't find this anywhere in OUR Constitution. If our current members of congress truly want this, then move to socialistic country....there's a few to choose from.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. Do you plan on "sneaking" in a rule stating "should this pass, it will never be able to be challenged by another congress..."? I don't want to give you any ideas, but this current congress is on a roll to government take-overs.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Wendy Katerberg  
January 5, 2010, 9:14 am  
8340 Wallinwood Springs  
Jenison, Michigan 49428

I only read up to page 61....and it doesn't pass the smell test. Why does our government think their involvement can/will improve things? At this moment, I cannot think of one example (there must be at least one!) where the governments "rules and regulations" improve the subject matter. As of now, we have competition to turn to...we still have a monopoly with Comcast (I don't have a choice at this time). Please don't muddy the waters any more.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

frank keen  
January 5, 2010, 9:15 am  
581 21st  
avalon, New Jersey 8202

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

keep your dirty rotten socialist hands off our internet, you haVE TAKEN OVER EVERYTHING else!!!!!!

Edith Keenan  
January 5, 2010, 9:16 am  
3304 125th Ave NE  
Lake Stevens, Washington 98258

Following is my comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please leave the internet alone and don't mess things up for the public!

Janet Keller  
January 5, 2010, 9:16 am  
1201 Buttercup Lane  
Wake Forest, North Carolina 27587

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am opposed to government control of the internet. The government has too much control over so many other areas. Leave the internet alone!

Donna Kelley  
January 5, 2010, 9:16 am  
232 McDermott Road  
Trafford, Pennsylvania 15085

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Whatever happened to government "by the people" .....not government by the government!!!

Thank you for reviewing my stand on this issue.

Donna J. Kelley 01/06/2010

Beatrice Kelly  
January 5, 2010, 9:17 am  
36 Califon Drive  
Colonia, New Jersey 7067

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Michael Kelly  
January 5, 2010, 9:18 am  
27 Periwinkle Dr  
Mt. Laurel, New Jersey 8054

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Susan Kelly  
January 5, 2010, 9:19 am  
45698 Bunker Hill Dr  
Farmington Hills, Michigan 48331

As a concerned citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The government does not need to have control over everything. The people are doing just fine thank you.

William Kelly  
January 5, 2010, 9:19 am  
12620 Lamplighter Sq  
St Louis, Missouri 63128

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Are you guys nuts? Keep your hands off our privacy and go away. All you want to do is gain power - power, and more power.

Bruce Kemp  
January 5, 2010, 9:21 am  
2420 Rock Creek Dr  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80528

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please stop this Government takeover of the internet now.

Sincerely,

Bruce D.Kemp

Donald Kemp  
January 5, 2010, 9:21 am  
221 Green Kemp Rd  
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23462-3435

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely  
Donald Kemp

Jack Kemp  
January 5, 2010, 9:22 am  
110-15 71 Road  
Forest Hills, New York 11375

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

What the current administration is trying to do would be an abomination, a power grab and would cause both problems and a backlash such as the government would not imagine. An attempt at “net neutrality” would be an utter failure that would just anger the citizenry.

Douglas Kennedy  
January 5, 2010, 9:22 am  
3172 Highland Village Drive  
Apt. 12  
Duluth, Minnesota 55811

As a citizen of the United States in support of the actions of Americans for Prosperity, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Stay away from the Internet. This is not China.

Jeff Kennedy  
January 5, 2010, 9:23 am  
1031 Evangeline Rd E  
Quincy, Illinois 62301

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,  
Jeff Kennedy

Stephen Kennedy  
January 5, 2010, 9:26 am  
1503 S. Cliff Drive  
Gallup, New Mexico 87301-5903

As an American with a longstanding belief that government is for the people (rather than the people being for government), I am submitting the following comment regarding preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. As a former legislator who was responsible for issues involving business and commerce, I find it highly irregular that a non-elected, appointed commission is trying to usurp the legislative authority of Congress is regulation of interstate and international commerce.

The Internet is also the means of communications for many people of all political persuasions. It is an essential means of communication for many people who live in rural areas that have limited telephone and television service (e.g., the Navajo Nation). Traditional telephone and traditional cable TV companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers. Wireless communications is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections.

The crux of the issue is that if a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



John Kenny  
January 5, 2010, 9:27 am  
200 Hilltop Rd.  
Plymouth Meeting, Pennsylvania 19462

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Stop this Fascism !

Emily Kent  
January 5, 2010, 9:27 am  
4168 Seven Lakes West  
Seven Lakes, North Carolina 27376

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

This Country was founded on individual freedom!!! Why does the current administration think it has the right to take individual rights away? I know who has the power, but if you all keep grabbing those rights, you may find the American people are fed up with your power grab. You work for us!!! We pay your generous salaries!!!!!!

Nelson R Kerr, Jr  
January 5, 2010, 9:28 am  
704 Richmond Road  
Williamsburg, Virginia 23185

I submit the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercises control over the Internet, there will be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty, create litigation risks, and discourage entrepreneurial efforts by lowering the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former Socialist White House adviser Susan Crawford.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down the fascist path of yet another government controlled component of industry.

I fear that the Commission is now contemplating Internet content restrictions inhibiting my own and others First Amendment rights to free expression and access to the means of publishing our thoughts without fear of governmental censorship, such as suggested by paragraph 77 of the NPRM. It is not the proper function of the Commission to control which competing interests should be prioritized by governmental fiat.

The anti-free speech advocates of “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their footless claims should be rejected as left-wing political polemical. There is no evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior. Without the ipse dixit claims of the proponents, there is no rational basis for imposing new regulations that will necessarily have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

As Moses said "Let my people go!"

michael kershner  
January 5, 2010, 9:29 am  
506 purslane point  
venice, Florida 34293

Keep the Government out of the Internet, PERIOD! It seems to be doing just fine as it is.

Brian Kessler  
January 5, 2010, 9:29 am  
18 Lupton Lane  
New Bern, North Carolina 28560

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The government or the OBAMA clowns need to stay out of the free enterprise system and let it regulate itself.

Jerris & Jim Kidd  
January 5, 2010, 9:31 am  
2181 Kidd Lane  
Little River, South Carolina 29566

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

**STOP SUFFOCATING OUR FREEDOMS !!!**

Hugh Kiernan  
January 5, 2010, 9:32 am  
193 Raymond Place  
Staten Island, New York 10310

As an American and a user of the Internet, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The proposed "Open internet" rules if implemented will limit the existing highly evolved competitive nature of this incredible resource while at the same time it will impose unnecessary and unwarranted government interference on its use by citizens and businesses alike.

The "public utility" model would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress. The FCC should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

Mike Killebrew  
January 5, 2010, 9:32 am  
5102 Beverly Hills Dr.  
Austin, Texas 78731

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Government “fixing” something that is not broken constitutes an act of repression that is in direct conflict with the Bill of Rights.



David Kimsey  
January 5, 2010, 9:34 am  
2920 Chesterfield Way SE  
Conyers, Georgia 30013

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Neither of these options is acceptable and both would be an affront to principles on which this country was founded.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Evelyn King  
January 5, 2010, 9:35 am  
6321 14th Street Sw  
Loveland, Colorado 80537

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

First, I oppose the Open Internet Rule.

Second, I support a privately owned and controlled network, which is competitive and truly open to all new invention.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jean King  
January 5, 2010, 9:35 am  
4929 Wildcat Mountain Road  
Paris, Arkansas 72855

What do you people in DC think you are doing? You cannot take over everything.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Karen King  
January 5, 2010, 9:39 am  
1941 E. Ranolph  
Enid, Oklahoma 73701

Concerning the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The freedoms the current internet situation affords both in this country and internationally are too valuable for anyone to consider a so-called "Open Internet" plan.

As I see it, "Open Internet" is a means of initializing controls that would so limit investment returns that it would cause a reduction of financial and inventive investments which would cripple both internet freedoms and developmental progress.

This crippling scenario would also provide the means for yet another government take over disguised as a government "rescue" funded by more taxpayer money.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is an open door for politicizing, power grabbing and criminal favoritism.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Bari Kinne  
January 5, 2010, 9:40 am  
648 W. Briarcliff Rd.  
Bolingbrook, Illinois 60440

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

More and more, this administration is beginning to sound like a combination of the novels entitled '1984' and 'Animal Farm', both by George Orwell. Freedom of the Internet equates to freedom of speech and freedom of the press, both of which are protected by the Constitution of the United States.

Bari Kinne  
January 5, 2010, 9:40 am  
648 W. Briarcliff Rd.  
Bolingbrook, Illinois 60440

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. The government should have NO control over the freedom of information available to the public for the public. I believe this is unconstitutional!

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Lorrie Kinser  
January 5, 2010, 9:41 am  
48031 200th Ave  
Chariton, Iowa 50049

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change. The internet is not a government entity and should be left alone. The government can not possibly take care of the internet. Proof being when they allowed our veterans social security numbers to be stolen from their "secure" hands. This is an issue that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. Better yet by the citizens who use the internet. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jerry Kirby  
January 5, 2010, 9:42 am  
1604 Flying Jib Drive  
Azle, Texas 76020

On behalf of the Kirby family and as an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jerry D. Kirby  
Janice E. Kirby



Michael Kirkpatrick  
January 5, 2010, 9:43 am  
364 cr 1535  
Jacksonville, Texas 75766

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Leave it alone.

Marilyn Kitt  
January 5, 2010, 9:46 am  
P.O. Box 7  
Garden Valley, California 95633

PLEASE NOTE THE FOLLOWING: As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

THE PUBLIC HAVE LITTLE TO ENJOY ANYWAY, IF YOU TOOK THIS FREEDOM AWAY, YOU HAVE TAKEN THE LAST FREE THING AMERICANS HAVE. YOU HAVE ESSENTIALLY TAKEN AWAY THEIR NEWS, THEIR RIGHT TO TALK, THEIR COMMUNICATION WITH FAMILY/FRIENDS.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

PLEASE DON'T REGULATE THE INTERNET. YOU WOULD CRUSH THE RIGHTS INDICATED IN THE FIRST AMENDMENT OF EVERY AMERICAN CITIZEN!

THERE IS TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT INVOLVEMENT. TRUST ME, I'M ON TO CONGRESS, AND SO ARE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE. LAY OFF THE RIGHTS OF THE PEOPLE.

Sincerely,

Marilyn Kitt, Attorney at Law, RN, MPH, JD

Peter Klein  
January 5, 2010, 9:47 am  
4480 N Oakland Ave #308  
Shorewood, Wisconsin 53211

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Robert Kloc  
January 5, 2010, 9:48 am  
6802 S Seven Mi Rd  
Freeland, Michigan 48623

Please do not support this "Open Internet" or "net neutrality bill. It is an infringement on our free speech.

Nick Klonitsko  
January 5, 2010, 9:49 am  
4906 grid St.  
Bowie, Maryland 20720

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Furthermore, I am against additional government regulation; especially a utility. We need to let the internet grow and discover new innovations. Regulations such as the the financial segment beat to death with mortgages; only encourage workarounds. Please, no more regulations..

Michael Klopka  
January 5, 2010, 9:49 am  
2110 Diamond Mountain Road  
Calistoga, California 94515

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This is just another attempt of our government to control the lives of its citizens without concern or interest if what we really want or how we really feel about these serious issues. I urge deep, open discussion on these far-reaching issues and listen to this country's citizens!

Jarvis Knapp  
January 5, 2010, 9:50 am  
55 Primrose rd  
Hardwick, New Jersey 7825

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Federal Government growth is out of control, stop unwanted and unnecessary regulation of our lives.

JoAnn Kneynsberg  
January 5, 2010, 9:52 am  
2603 Trillium Circle  
Bessemer, Alabama 35022

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Wayne Kochenderfer  
January 5, 2010, 9:52 am  
710 Flite Acres Rd  
Wimberley, Texas 78676

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We already have too much government intervention being foisted upon us...and it is not working. We don't need more.

Arden Koelling  
January 5, 2010, 9:52 am  
1708 R St.  
Ord, Nebraska 68862

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that must be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ryan Kohler  
January 5, 2010, 9:55 am  
116 Southwood Trace  
Collinsville, Illinois 62234

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Remember the People have rights; the government has privileges.

William Kokes  
January 5, 2010, 9:55 am  
505 Cypress Station Drive  
Houston, Texas 77090

IF IT AIN'T BROKE - DON'T FIX IT! ITS FINE AS IS!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Regina Kolbow  
January 5, 2010, 9:56 am  
2515 Williams  
Stoughton, Wisconsin 53589

As an American citizen who appreciates free speech and freedom, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Stephen Kole  
January 5, 2010, 9:56 am  
20 Buckley Street  
Port Jervis, New York 12771

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

**FINALLY: KEEP YOUR GODDAMNED HANDS OFF THE INTERNET!!!**

James Kolka  
January 5, 2010, 9:58 am  
8268 Sarah Ct  
Grosse Ile, Michigan 48138

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Frankly, the government is too incompetent to manage the internet or anything else.

Michael Konkel  
January 5, 2010, 10:04 am  
7508 Clover Meadow Dr  
Fort Wayne, Indiana 46815

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

So bottom line here is, Mark Lloyd, you simply need to clock out and go home...your services are no longer required by the American people....we do not need socialists in government.



David Korb  
January 5, 2010, 10:05 am  
35 White Pine Dr  
Asheville, North Carolina 28805

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I strongly oppose any government laws or regulations on the internet, whether infrastructure or content (i.e. data).

Sanford L Korschun  
January 5, 2010, 10:05 am  
607 Lake Shore Drive  
Post Office Drawer 10669  
Goldsboro, North Carolina 27532

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

To make it clear. Mr. McChesney, nor Susan Crawford are not the caliber nor do they have the ethics to represent me in this matter or any other matter. Let the government involvement already authorized, often in violation of the Constitution of the United States of America, be proven effective and workable before jumping to new areas. Those unhappy with doing this, always have the option of leaving and setting up camp elsewhere in the world.

todd korth  
January 5, 2010, 10:07 am  
51 s wynnoak  
woodlands, Texas 77382

I submit the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Georgette M Koselke  
January 5, 2010, 10:09 am  
2209 N Val Vista Drive  
Mesa, Arizona 85213

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please heed what the American public wants...hands off...there is not one successful bureau the government directs...post office, Social Security, Fannie Mae and the list goes on.

Georgette M Koselke

Elizabeth Kouri  
January 5, 2010, 10:10 am  
13732 W 76th Circle  
Lenexa, Kansas 66216

As an American who believes we need less government in our daily lives, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

rrobert koziol  
January 5, 2010, 10:10 am  
1331 tennis drive  
bedford, Texas 76022

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

ROBERT L. KOZIOL

Ken Kreitz  
January 5, 2010, 10:11 am  
7914 South Woods Drive  
Fredericksburg, Virginia 22408

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In a matter of minutes anyone with very basic "technology" skills is able to set up an Internet site. While an "over-zealous" legislator may see some harm in this free expression and basic free-market principle, those of us who value the fundamental principles of Liberty are discussed that this even even under serious consideration.

Sincerely,

Ken Kreitz

Hannah Krening  
January 5, 2010, 10:12 am  
4922 Delaware Dr  
4922 Delaware Dr  
Larkspur, Colorado 80118

Regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet: GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The government has no legitimate role in the internet, and its involvement is immoral. A government's proper role is only to protect individual rights, and laws already exist which will protect rights in matters of the internet.

Furthermore, government regulation will hamper or render it meaningless.

Except as a blatant power grab and violation of free speech rights, there is no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Joyce Krey  
January 5, 2010, 10:13 am  
4618 Barby Ln.  
Madison, Wisconsin 53704-1708

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We DO NOT more government control. This IS a FREE COUNTRY and we want to keep it that way.!!!

Barbara Kronewitter  
January 5, 2010, 10:13 am  
199 s. catalina st.  
ventura, California 93001

I believe the internet works wonderfully as it now operates. We do NOT need to have the government regulate anything about it. We citizens have been allowed to think for ourselves thus far and determine how we wish to use it. Please do not take away one of our few remaining freedoms.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

julie kroninger  
January 5, 2010, 10:13 am  
1501 w. gramercy st.  
1501 w. gramercy st.  
san antonio, Texas 78201

As an American, I submit the following comment regarding preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is Freedom of Speech. Block it any way & it's the end of America.

Now, if you want to help, go for the crimes they perform OVER the internet.  
Such as Child Pornography. Anyone doing this over the internet is a criminal... arrest them. Shut down THAT site. Are they doing Terrorist activity over the internet? Terrorism is a crime. Shut down THAT site.  
But do not throw the baby out with the bathwater!!!  
Freedom of Speech is not a crime!

Transforming the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is not a path I want to see America going!

Lance Paul Krzywicki  
January 5, 2010, 10:14 am  
3388 Parkridge DR  
Marianna, Florida 32446

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. My family had to flee Russia because of a Lenin, it seems that the same policy are coming to America.

Mark Kubena  
January 5, 2010, 10:14 am  
19 Woolston Way  
Washington, New Jersey 7882

Look at government run TSA-a joke and almost disasterous,  
Social Security-another joke, Medicare-another joke. The only thing our government is good at is our Military, God Bless them!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Cynthia Kuchenbecker  
January 5, 2010, 10:15 am  
1090 Park ST  
Baker City, Oregon 97814

I am totally against the government takeover of the internet. It will only result in something that dosen't work very well and will cost the taxpayers more money. The Internet is a communication facilitator. Whatever is posted is up to the person who posted. It is a great example of free speech.

The Government wants to control what is broadcasted over the Internet. We can no longer trust the news media to give us all the information and that it is not slanted to meet some political viewpoint. It is our only option to get good information.

carl Kuehne  
January 5, 2010, 10:16 am  
2050 Riverside Drive  
Green Bay, Wisconsin 54301

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

I am particularly about the "Law of Unintended Consequences" with regard to the government starting down this path of regulation and control.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Garth Kuhnhein  
January 5, 2010, 10:16 am  
3084 Prestwicke Dr.  
Edgewood, Kentucky 41017

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Respectfully submitted,  
Garth Kuhnhein



Garth Kuhnhein  
January 5, 2010, 10:17 am  
3084 Prestwicke Dr.  
Edgewood, Kentucky 41017

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Respectfully submitted,  
Garth Kuhnhein

Jocelyn Kunkle  
January 5, 2010, 10:17 am  
13 Audrey Dr.  
Carson City, Nevada 89706

Why does the government have to take control of something that already works fine? just for power. Just to control free speech, and freedom of business.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jo Kuppe  
January 5, 2010, 10:18 am  
P.O. Box 5252  
Columbus, Georgia 31906

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Renee Kurecki  
January 5, 2010, 10:18 am  
1324 Oak Point Ct  
Venice, Florida 34292

The transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jeffrey Kurr  
January 5, 2010, 10:19 am  
P. O. Box 288  
Oxford, Mississippi 38655

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers.

The government should find a way to enforce child porn laws where it takes place on the internet. There is NO reason why the government should take over the use of the internet. This only serves as an opportunity to regulate and tax but there is on benefit to the taxpayer. The government encumbers everything it touches.

Harry Kusnic  
January 5, 2010, 10:20 am  
119 Matisse Circle  
Aliso Viejo, California 92656

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

Any form of regulation on the internet now would take away its freedoms, which will inevitably make it a biased instrument for a governing party of control. The internet is too great a tool for free expression to be controlled. Its freedom from control is what has made it so great. The internet stands as a symbol of the freedom that our Country was founded for. To limit those freedoms is a slam against the Constitution of the United States of America. Anyone who wishes to control the internet can not have good intentions for their plan. Instead, I submit that anyone wishing to control the internet has selfish agendas in mind that will not benefit the good of the people. There are plenty of options for people who want to protect themselves or family from internet contacts that are morally questionable. Internet regulation would be totally wrong, as it would just be a way to take away freedoms, instead of increasing them. We must stand for our freedoms now in this country, more than ever.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior (actually - The internet in its current unregulated form is the most competitive), there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Leave our freedoms alone in this Country, especially the internet.

Frank Kwapnioski  
January 5, 2010, 10:21 am  
1120 Miles Ct  
North Platte, Nebraska 69101

As an American Citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Alan LaBar  
January 5, 2010, 10:24 am  
86  
LaBar Lane  
White Earth, North Dakota 58794

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Melanie Ladines  
January 5, 2010, 10:26 am  
605 Casa Park Court G  
Winter Springs, Florida 32708

You politicians sicken the Public whom you are supposed to serve. The 2010 elections will show the extent to which we detest those of you who serve your own desires over those which actually will benefit your constituents.

As a concerned American citizen and single mother, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Marci Laffen  
January 5, 2010, 10:26 am  
301 S. Sunflower Lane  
Andover, Kansas 67002

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Back off with your socialistic endeavors! Our Constitution was not created to have such an over-reaching government.

MJ Lakin  
January 5, 2010, 10:28 am  
1610 Edmondson Rd ne  
Hanceville, Alabama 35077

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

MJ Lakin  
January 5, 2010, 10:29 am  
1610 Edmondson Rd ne  
Hanceville, Alabama 35077

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dun Lana  
January 5, 2010, 10:30 am  
3445 Heritage Pkwy.  
Sherman, Texas 75092

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,  
L. Dun

William Lancaster  
January 5, 2010, 10:30 am  
2443 Stockton St.  
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27127

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. The government has become a vehicle to take over all aspects of communications in the U.S.A.; and making much money by charging taxes, surcharges, and any other way to take citizens money. Control of all communication by the government would amount to dictatorship. Americans can't afford to let this happen, now or later. Thanks for your attention. Bill L.!

Rebecca Landau  
January 5, 2010, 10:32 am  
400 Hwy 70 East  
Hillsborough, North Carolina 27278

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Kenneth & Teresa Landon  
January 5, 2010, 10:34 am  
11414 Huntsman Drive  
Manassas, Virginia 20112

First, we would like to say that we are applauded that once again our rights are eroding away. We do use the internet daily and we are on a fixed income so therefore we will not be able to pay high cost to pay for the internet, we feel we will have no place to go when or if the government takes over the technology. Availability means a lot to us!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, we are submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

We are especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Kirk Laney  
January 5, 2010, 10:35 am  
4301 high Mesa Dr.  
Plano, Texas 75093

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, it has come to my attention that the government is once again trying to over-regulate a critical piece of our free market system. The failure to even attempt this when there is no successful track record as a reference point is rather assinine. Additionally, the rightfully paranoid see another power grab of a key piece of our freedom of speech infrastructure that is unacceptable. Futhermore, potentially stifling communication stifles our ability to innovate and maintain competitiveness in global high tech markets.

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Cheryl Langdon  
January 5, 2010, 10:36 am  
370 Jefferson Ave.  
Fairport, New York 14450

I believe in freedom. The Internet, as it stands now, is the most free place for expression.

Government meddling (China) with the Internet, its content, its availability, its format, its business model, or any other aspect of it, can only cause it to be at the mercy of various political whims.

It isn't broken. Please leave it alone.

Nancy Lange  
January 5, 2010, 10:38 am  
5170 W. Indian Camp Rd.  
Prescott, Arizona 86305

As an American citizen and a taxpayer, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

J Buford Langston  
January 5, 2010, 10:40 am  
555 Affleck Road  
Brenham, Texas 77833

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of attenuating this great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James Langston  
January 5, 2010, 10:41 am  
po box 12  
Idleyld Park, Oregon 97447

We do not need another government control/intrusion into our lives.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ed Larson  
January 5, 2010, 10:41 am  
657 S. Milan Rd  
Milan, Kansas 67105

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I will vote against anyone that is for this. Ed Larson

Georgette Lasorso  
January 5, 2010, 10:42 am  
129 Water St.  
Hillsville, Virginia 24343

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

The Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Frank Lathrop  
January 5, 2010, 10:42 am  
8300 Hempstead Road, Suite A  
Houston, Texas 77008

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We have seen what government controls of the Internet does for the people--we do not want the US Government to act in the same fashion as the Governments of Iran and China act.



May Lattanzio  
January 5, 2010, 10:45 am  
POB 1351  
youngstown, Florida 324661351

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I would like to remind you that I do not live in a totalitarian state, or country. I believe in the free exchange of information, creative thought and expression and bringing people across the world closer in understanding through a free internet.

Sharon Laughlin  
January 5, 2010, 10:45 am  
PO Box 249  
Lindstrom, Minnesota 55045

Regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

This “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation. Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Leave the Internet as a private entity - it is the only way to assure that it is, in fact, free.

Jean Lauver  
January 5, 2010, 10:46 am  
1061 Stonehenge Drive  
Hanahan, South Carolina 29410

No - leave our internet alone. The government can't even protect us from terrorist attacks - let them focus on the important things and keep their noses out of the others. Check with the American people and start listening to us.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Stack Lavin  
January 5, 2010, 10:47 am  
2306 Rainier  
Spokane, West Virginia 99208

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional phone and cable companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously, it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will inhibit and overly burden business models that may otherwise be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risk. Such restrictions and related increased risk would lower or at least appear to lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that many such investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either be crippled or have to be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would accordingly bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and so called Free Press founder, Robert McChesney. These are not spokespeople for what would make a better business model, but instead, representatives of a frightening socialist agenda.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us further down the nightmare to socialism.

I am very concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Respectfully submitted,

Jordan Law  
January 5, 2010, 10:49 am  
2525 Shiloh Rd #413  
Tyler, Texas 75703

The "Government" was created by our founding fathers to PROTECT the common interest of the then "New America". That common interest being the principle of FREEDOM, LIBERTY, HAPPINESS, LIFE AND MANY OTHER INALIENABLE RIGHTS given to us at birth.

Things such as "open internet" are the seemingly small, yet very large and forceful ways our excuse for a real Government is taking control, and in turn taking away our rights, and the protection of those rights and insuring that our country will fall, and our constitution be no more.

NO TO OPEN INTERNET!!!

Ruth Lawler  
January 5, 2010, 10:50 am  
Box 386  
Kasilof, Alaska 99610

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

WARNING: Don't tread on me.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

scott lawler  
January 5, 2010, 10:51 am  
4891 wheatstone  
fairfax, Virginia 22032

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am adamantly OPPOSED to government regulation of the Internet. Private business invests in delivering products and services and that competition delivers outstanding service to customers across the US.

Additional government bureaucracy will drive up costs, increase taxes, and add complexity to the business environment all of which increases costs to consumers and reduces access.

DO NOT attempt to increase regulation on the Internet. The government has NO RESPONSIBILITY and NO AUTHORITY in the Constitution to regulate private business like this.

UNACCEPTABLE!!!

Scott Lawler  
Fairfax, VA

Sanley Lawrence  
January 5, 2010, 10:53 am  
1098 S. State Road 115  
Wabash, Indiana 46992

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Keep the government out of our lives and homes! You work for us, not us for you! Remember that! We will replace you in the blink of an eye! We are sick and tired of big government!! And our supposed president is not even a legal resident, You know it and so do we!! The United States of America belong to the citizens, NOT the government.

Our founding Fathers had the insight to know this would happen if government got too big and power hungry. We will not tolerate it any longer!! Be well aware of the citizens and what you have been told. We mean business and are not afraid to defend our country against tyranny. We did it once and we can do it again! You best heed the Constitution and Bill of Rights you swore to defend and uphold when you took office. You have awakened a silent Eagle with sharp talons! Beware, power mongers!!!



Mark Lawson  
January 5, 2010, 10:54 am  
1253 N. Wilson Lake Rd.  
Columbia City, Indiana 46725

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

**HANDS OFF OF OUR FREE SPEECH. REGULATE COMMERCE, NOT THOUGHT!**

Russell Lawson  
January 5, 2010, 10:57 am  
14232 Marsh Lane  
#325  
Addison, Texas 75001

As an American citizen who believes in free speech, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If private companies block or censor Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Glenn Leaman  
January 5, 2010, 10:59 am  
132 Stone Quarry Rd  
Leola, Pennsylvania 17540

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We've had enough of this STUPIDITY - STOP NOW!!!!

Mark LeBar  
January 5, 2010, 11:00 am  
177 Longview Heights Rd.  
Athens, Ohio 45701

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. But if government exercises control over the Internet, there will be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Richard Lechleitner  
January 5, 2010, 11:03 am  
208 Greenwood Drive  
New Cumberland, Pennsylvania 17070

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Richard Lechleitner  
January 5, 2010, 11:03 am  
208 Greenwood Drive  
New Cumberland, Pennsylvania 17070

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Nancy Lee  
January 5, 2010, 11:03 am  
8711 Meadow Lane  
Leawood, Kansas 66206

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ramon Lee  
January 5, 2010, 11:05 am  
11557 Auldbury Way  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27617

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

**BACK OFF THE BIG BROTHER REGULATION!**

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Robert Lee  
January 5, 2010, 11:06 am  
1485 Canoe Creek Drive  
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80906

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Robert Lee  
January 5, 2010, 11:08 am  
2602 N Park Ave  
Tifton, Georgia 31794

As a concerned citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic it would lose its customers. Our current system is working. If government exercised control over the Internet as proposed, there would be no place to turn; there would be no competition ensuring a true open society. The government run system would be what the "government" would want.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

You propose rescuing a system that does not require it. The free market open internet system works. A government takeover would inevitably bring politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. This isn't nor should it be the Commission's responsibility.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is no rationale for imposing new regulations that could negatively effect innovation, growth, and expression that the current and competitive Internet has become.

Ronald Lee  
January 5, 2010, 11:09 am  
1937 King St  
Denver, Colorado 80204

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Susan Lee  
January 5, 2010, 11:09 am  
P.O. Box 11133  
Danville, Virginia 24543

In addition to the comments below, this sums up my thoughts on this subject:

S-T-A-Y O-U-T O-F O-U-R L-I-V-E-S  
and L-E-A-V-E U-S A-L-O-N-E

Take your radical, Socialist ideas to another country where the citizens want the government to run their lives. Your government takeovers are not welcome in America. Leave our businesses and private sector and freedoms alone.

\* \* \* \* \*

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Susan Leeper  
January 5, 2010, 11:12 am  
12309 N. 90th Way  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85260

As an concerned US citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please ensure that the Government keeps its hands off the Internet. This is merely another way for Obama and his cronies to command and control.

Nina Leifeste  
January 5, 2010, 11:12 am  
62 Squankum Rd  
Colts Neck, New Jersey 7722

As an American who is sick and tired of having my human rights clobbered, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ellen Leisher  
January 5, 2010, 11:14 am  
234 West Cottage Place  
York, Pennsylvania 17401

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

On top of all the above, control of the internet would be a violation of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and my personal freedom to view what I choose on the internet. My work also involves use of the internet and I am not self-employed. I am against this due to my right to work at my job and in defense of the company that employs me to accomplish their goals.

I am tired of the government interfering in all aspects of my life. You do not know what is best for me. Only I know what is best for me.

The U.S. government had better step back take a breath and consider that we are your bosses, not the other way around, so stop telling us what we can smoke, eat, drink, or read or watch or view in books, on TV and in movies, as well as on the internet.

Butt out why don't you! You are making an increasing amount of your constituents extremely angry and they may eventually hand you your come-uppance. I know I am ready to do so and have been for some time.

Honor Leitzen  
January 5, 2010, 11:15 am  
4852 W Braddock Rd Apt 2  
Alexandria, Virginia 22311

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I work in this industry, and have been a supervisor or manager at several telecoms and internet service providers, including Qwest, Verizon, Cogent Communications, NTT America, and Transaction Network Services. As it exists today, the industry is not 'broken', nor does it need fixing, nor regulation as proposed. The government should only step in to stop illegal activity, as it does now with the full cooperation of the providers, on problems such as scams and child pornography.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. This will be similar to a DDOS, which is a Directed Denial Of Service attack, where a hostile entity attempts to shut down a providers traffic, and the affect will be the same: the providers will be damaged and the customers will lose services.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Continued free competition is the best way to ensure fair representation on the internet, just as is the case with other media outlets. Every time the government steps in, regulations become burdensome, cumbersome, and both the provider and the customer is harmed, not helped.

Thank you for your consideration.



brad leker  
January 5, 2010, 11:16 am  
2453 east elmwood place  
chandler, Arizona 85249

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I do not want the government to control the internet in any way. I want to be able to search the web, communicate with organizations, research info etc without any changes or regulation.

Please do not let the government congress, president obama or anyone else change it.

Richard W Lemke  
January 5, 2010, 11:19 am  
5094 Norwood Drive  
Bettendorf, Iowa 52722

As an American for the First Amendment, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

bill lemos  
January 5, 2010, 11:20 am  
395 south hampton club way  
st augustine, Florida 32092

dearest bigger and more government intervention lovers,

the giant is now fully awake and getting more and more riled up by the minute.

i am certain none of you could have forecast the keen interest we are all taking in your backroom dirty dealings - all the while stabbing dedicated hard working Americans in the back.

you all have made a crucial mistake thinking you could ramrod all this detrimental nonsense down our throats while we sit complacently by, content with staying on the sidelines.

we are coming to the fray, and we know exactly what to do to rid our great nation of the fools who believe they can dupe all Americans, all the while grabbing as much power and money as possible.

william lemos  
January 5, 2010, 11:21 am  
395 south hampton club way  
st augustine, Florida 32092

You folks are getting a little too big for your own britches. you are setting this country up for ugly times ahead. your constituents are watching and noticing your blatant power grabs and egregious spending sprees. good luck holding on to your precious power. true blooded americans are figuring out what is going on and rising up.

Robert Leonard  
January 5, 2010, 11:22 am  
1065 Spruce Street  
Winnetka, Illinois 60093

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will be counterproductive, discouraging companies from providing the expensive infrastructure necessary to increase network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense. Worse, this concept picks private winners and losers, with a wealthy company like Google being subsidized by depressed companies like AT&T and Verizon.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Barry Lerner  
January 5, 2010, 11:26 am  
59 franklin  
rye, New York 10580

As a concerned American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Michael Leslie  
January 5, 2010, 11:27 am  
12816 Chancel Court  
Fort Wayne, Indiana 46845

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Regulation should be an option of last resort to resolve a far reaching problem. The problem that this regulation is purporting to solve does not currently exist. The regulation is therefore unnecessary and inappropriate at this time.

vickie lessi  
January 5, 2010, 11:29 am  
p o box 2749  
turlock, California 95381

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, and an American citizen concerned with freedom and against the government control and take over of the internet, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

I am not in favor of government interfering or taking over private industry or limiting our freedom of speech via the internet or any other venue. Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. And I don't trust those in government at this time to make good decisions for America. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. This, to me, is a path to the long-desired censorship on the part of those radicals (elected and unelected) in our government, and is a tactic of communists, Marxists, socialists, fascists, tyrants and dictators.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Kathy Leugers  
January 5, 2010, 11:31 am  
7576 Trailwind Dr  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45242

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Cynthia Lightcap  
January 5, 2010, 11:31 am  
238 Talking Rock Creek Drive  
Chatsworth, Georgia 30705

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Butt out.

Cynthia Lightcap

Meta Lind  
January 5, 2010, 11:34 am  
433 SANDRA PLACE  
EAGLE, Idaho 83616

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Terrence Linderman  
January 5, 2010, 11:37 am  
249 Lorraine Circle  
Bloomington, Illinois 60108

I support the following comments regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Aaron Lindsey  
January 5, 2010, 11:39 am  
1465 Sharon Hills CT  
Kannapolis, North Carolina 28083

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank you for your consideration and allowing me to voice my concerns! =)

Sumer Linger  
January 5, 2010, 11:39 am  
11836 Hawthorn Woods Court  
Loveland, Ohio 45140

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

William Links  
January 5, 2010, 11:39 am  
611 South Main St. #6  
Fond Du Lac, Wisconsin 54935

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This is just another attempt by the government and the fcc to have control over all our free speech including the internet. or as liberals say any natural american who speaks up and uses their free speech right is domestic terrorists. like hell we are for standing up for our legal constitutional GOD given rights. and written by our founding fathers.

william

Charles Linthicum  
January 5, 2010, 11:42 am  
8409 Twin Lakes Blvd  
Tampa, Florida 33614

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet, GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I trust the free market under the free enterprise economic system (what's left of it). If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers.

I do NOT trust CONgress, gubmint agencies or bureaucrats like you. Everything the federal gubmint has touched has turned to \$#!+. Just look at the last two years. The blame must be placed entirely with the federal government, the (not really) Federal (with no) Reserve and their crony banking/corporate interests. Unlike the internet service providers, we cannot fire you or would do so in a heartbeat.

The internet was created and has been working just fine without your "help" (i.e., control). Get your own house in order and leave me and the internet alone!

"In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men the great difficulty lies in this: You must first enable the government to control the governed, and in the next place, oblige it to control itself." (Alexander Hamilton)



Paul Linthorst  
January 5, 2010, 11:43 am  
19 Huntwood Place  
Mount Vernon, New York 10552-1215

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please recognize that the meteoric growth of the internet was effected by private investment and ingenuity. Discouraging private investment through confiscatory rulemaking would be a way to bring an end to one of America's most important competitive advantages.

We cannot afford to pile one more load on the free enterprise back without great risk of breaking it.

Ultimately a net-neutrality regulation would be an abrogation of the private property rights of those who have invested in internet infrastructure and one more nail into the coffin for free enterprise and free speech.

Bill Lioio  
January 5, 2010, 11:43 am  
P. O. Box 70011  
Eugene, Oregon 97401

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Salvatore Lipari  
January 5, 2010, 11:44 am  
6 Blair Drive  
Flanders, New Jersey 7836

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Levi Lippincott  
January 5, 2010, 11:46 am  
8530 Granville Pkwy #736  
LaVista, Nebraska 68128

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

joanne lippold  
January 5, 2010, 11:46 am  
5310 williams wharf road  
st. leonard, Maryland 20685

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Are we becoming a communist nation. .with this horror of a socialized agenda from Congress and this Corrupt WhiteHouse with Czars and crooks and cronies. . how dare you want to take control of more of our lives. .especially the internet. Enough is enough of this socialist agenda which follows with communism. . .who do you all think you are. ..Get a life and job and leave the internet and companies that manage it alone. ...Less government is better government. If you want to control something control the spending of this Administration and the Cronies and Corruption in Congress

Kenneth Lisiak  
January 5, 2010, 11:46 am  
17 Ross Lane  
Middleton, Massachusetts 1949

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

These heavy-handed proposals to steal the internet from private citizens sound quite familiar... Isn't that one of our complaints about the Chinese Communists--Government Censorship of the Internet? Regulation at this level of detail is indistinguishable from control, which leads to nationalization (THINK POST OFFICE!! HORRORS!), which leads to politicized control, which leads to censorship, all of which is a temptation our government has already proven itself incapable of avoiding--just like the Chinese. Nip this disaster at the outset!!!

Jim Liston  
January 5, 2010, 11:47 am  
762 Berrymore Road  
Reidsville, North Carolina 27320

As an Americans for Prosperity supporter, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Richard Littiken  
January 5, 2010, 11:51 am  
314 Rhynewood Drive  
Sanford, North Carolina 27330

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Mildred Little  
January 5, 2010, 11:57 am  
65 Plantation RD  
Wetumpka, Alabama 36093

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

By remaining non-political, and non-controlled by Government, the Internet serves as a marvelous instrument for research and growth in knowledge for youth and adults when doing schoolwork, or for self-development. We used to have a free press in this country, but alas, that no longer is the case. We have to read news from other countries to learn what is happening in THIS country, and news we should know for our own good. Why has not the FCC investigated this very undemocratic control over our news media? It makes our "news" not "fit" to read, because when it only "parrots" what it is told to say, it becomes propaganda and managed "News". It can no longer be counted as reliable for reporting the news unbiasedly.

Since the Administration has sent us back to the dark ages by restricting our "free press" in newspapers, radio and television, it would be gross negligence on the part of the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and smell of "dictatorship" influence, should any limitations be placed on the free world-wide Internet.

Donald Littlefield  
January 5, 2010, 11:59 am  
569 Hall Street  
Folsom, California 95630-9545

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, it would mean the end to one very important outlet for the freedom of speech of all Americans.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The FTC should not stifle innovation nor should it dictate public policy. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Fonda LoBach  
January 5, 2010, 11:59 am  
PO Box 455  
Fruita, Colorado 81521

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This is my opinion not AFP's: This is just another attempt to take away our First Amendment Rights, to shut up any opposition to the current administration's policies. THIS IS WRONG AND NOT WHAT THIS COUNTRY WAS FOUNDED ON.

Janice Loebbaka  
January 5, 2010, 11:59 am  
3319 River Narrows Road  
Hilliard, Ohio 43026

The comments below the first paragraph is "canned" (and I agree with it) but this first paragraph is from me.

STAY THE HECK OUT REGULATING THE INTERNET. IT'S DOING JUST FINE AND THE COMPETITION FOR CUSTOMERS KEEPS THE PROVIDERS PROVIDING AN EXCELLENT PRODUCT AT AN EVER DECREASING PRICE. WE DON'T NEED MORE GOVERNMENT TAKE OVER OF ANYTHING.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Judy Loemker  
January 5, 2010, 11:59 am  
4663 ST. RT. 157, Box 634  
Edwardsville, Illinois 62025

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Protect our freedoms now! We do NOT want to become a socialist country and will fight to stop it and to preserve our Constitution!!!!

Gay Long  
January 5, 2010, 12:01 pm  
5313 Zion Avenue  
Lakeland, Florida 33810

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Patrick Henry said "... give me liberty or give me death!" We are entering an era where this, again, is an issue! The government does NOT have to "protect" me from all evil. I have power to do that - the power of "we the people!"

Gloria Longfellow  
January 5, 2010, 12:04 pm  
1405 Maplerow N.W.  
Grand Rapids, Michigan 49534

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Government is getting too invasive, and we as US citizens are fed up with the progressive meddling..TIME TO GET OUT OF OUR LIVES..NOW

Deborah Loomis  
January 5, 2010, 12:06 pm  
PO Box 6040  
Santa Barbara, California 93160

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the Internet has become.



Carlos R. & Lois A. Louthan  
January 5, 2010, 12:07 pm  
2734 Mulberry Gap Rd.  
Sneedville, Tennessee 37869

As Americans for Prosperity activist, we are submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

We are especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Carlos R. & Lois A. Louthan  
January 5, 2010, 12:08 pm  
2734 Mulberry Gap Rd.  
Sneedville, Tennessee 37869

As Americans for Prosperity activist, we are submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

We are especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ed Love  
January 5, 2010, 12:12 pm  
19443 Mill Oak  
San Antonio, Texas 78258

As a concerned citizen, and an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Arlene Luebbe  
January 5, 2010, 12:15 pm  
26 Rose Terrace  
Crestview Hills, Kentucky 41017

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Carolyn Luke  
January 5, 2010, 12:16 pm  
76748 Samarkand Drive  
Twentynine Palms, California 92277

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Carolyn Luke

Jane Lund  
January 5, 2010, 12:16 pm  
1385 Smith Way  
Bellingham, Washington 98226

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Barbara Lurger  
January 5, 2010, 12:17 pm  
15300 NW 180th Avenue  
Alachua, Florida 32615

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Aside from the above, regulating the internet in the way that is likely planned by the administration will result in the further loss of freedom of speech and the freedom to exchange ideas and information that is vital to the "workings" of a healthy, moral, intelligent, productive society. The citizens of our country will be ill served by a government that restricts internet communication/expression. In fact, the citizens will be cut off from this dynamic method of ensuring the continued survival of our republic.

John Lutz  
January 5, 2010, 12:18 pm  
P/O/ Box 8883  
Kalispell, Montana 59904-1883

Please give serious consideration to the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I believe the vast majority of the American Public would concur with the above. A free and unrestricted internet is vital to preservation of crucial First Amendment rights preservation in America.



Cliff Lyles  
January 5, 2010, 12:21 pm  
31 Wetlands Road  
White, Georgia 30184

In regards to GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

There's an old saying, "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."

For the love of freedom, leave the Internet alone! It works perfectly fine in it's current form. To intervene in this thriving area can only stifle and atrophe what has to be one of the greatest wonders of the world.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Spencer J. Lyman  
January 5, 2010, 12:22 pm  
10445 Poplar St  
10445 Poplar St  
Wakefield, Virginia 23888

The government takeover of the Internet would violate the U.S. Constitution as far as owning a privately run industry as well as violate the First Amendment once the Internet gets under the jurisdiction of the government then they will regulate it with restrictions that will limit the right to free speech and also could easily regulate it where no one can contact the outside world!!!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Danen Lynn  
January 5, 2010, 12:23 pm  
3594 Meadowlark Drive  
Casper, Wyoming 82604

Before reading the comment below, to which I fully agree, I would like you to hear straight from my own thoughts on the issue of regulating, or Stalinizing, the internet. China today regulates what its people can and can't see, and leaders of the United States frequently call for deregulation so the great people of China, its common citizens, can find out the truth for themselves.

Iran is doing the same thing as we speak. As protesters and journalists rush to their computers and cell phones to alert the world of the true happenings within the borders of Iran, websites are being blocked and cell phone coverage disrupted, so a corrupt and violent regime can maintain control.

Any act by the FCC to limit the content of the internet will bring the same characterization, corrupt and controlling. You not only take away the God given right to chose for one's self, but you begin to manipulate the direction of a free nation toward one of decades and decades of poverty, war, and isolation.

These same things have happened throughout history and we will suffer the same fates as the USSRs and Chinas that have gone before us if you continue to pursue such an unjust, unlawful, and unconstitutional path.

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James H. Mabie  
January 5, 2010, 12:27 pm  
P.O. Box 2365  
Joplin, Missouri 64803

I respectfully submit the following regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is, and should remain, highly competitive. There is no justification for imposing new regulations that would unquestionably slow the impetus of innovation, growth, and expression that the competitive Internet has become. I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately assume authority for which competing interests should be prioritized.

The proposed burden of proof for requiring network management practices is an unreasonable constraint and will strangle the free development of business ventures that may be economically efficient, impose uncertainty in the market, and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investment in building network capacity, discouraging further investment and crippling the growth of the internet. This appears to be a desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, such as former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney, since it would put the internet into position to be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, inevitably bringing government control and politicization along with government ownership. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers; however, if government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no other options available.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, our legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not allocate to itself regulatory changes that will force us down this path and restrict the freedom of the internet.

Carole Mace  
January 5, 2010, 12:28 pm  
2820 Coldwater St.  
Connelly Springs, North Carolina 28612

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I am "fed" up with continued efforts for more government control.

Lois MacHale  
January 5, 2010, 12:30 pm  
12352 Priscilla Lane  
Los Altos Hills, California 94022

Knock it off! No government takeover of the Internet! FREEDOM OF SPEECH !!!!!

Edward Maciula  
January 5, 2010, 12:32 pm  
2783 River Way  
Spring Branch, Texas 78070

I endorse the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dee MacKay  
January 5, 2010, 12:34 pm  
2424 Queen St  
Winston Salem, North Carolina 27103

Please leave the American public something free and free of Government interference. Leave our internet alone. As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Delores MacKay  
January 5, 2010, 12:35 pm  
2424 Queen St  
Winston Salem, North Carolina 27103

As a concerned American, I am asking everyone in any position to propose or vote or pass legislation to please leave the American people the freedom of the internet. We have lost enough of our freedoms through the years and the internet offers everyone a whole new world and means a lot to the American public. Please do not interfere with it.

Bill MacMaster  
January 5, 2010, 12:39 pm  
720 Lawson Bar Road  
Myrtle Creek, Oregon 97457

As an Americans, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mary MacMaster  
January 5, 2010, 12:41 pm  
inform4@juno.com  
Lake Orion, Michigan 48359

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Programming and Websites will live or die under their own accord due to their popularity or lack thereof. I do not want the FCC or any other government body dictating what can be viewed or violating our First Amendment protections.

Carol Magazzeni  
January 5, 2010, 12:45 pm  
4732 Sherman Road  
Kent, Ohio 44240

We must find a way to preserve the open Internet. My remarks are in reference to GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

Please preserve the free market; the free internet.

Carol Magazzeni  
January 5, 2010, 12:46 pm  
4732 Sherman Road  
Kent, Ohio 44240

We must find a way to preserve the open Internet. My remarks are in reference to GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

Please preserve the free market; the free internet.

Tim Maine  
January 5, 2010, 12:47 pm  
P.O. Box 20816  
Boulder, Colorado 80308

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The fact that those of the FCC that are democrats and barack obama want to do a so called "net neutrality" which is not neutral but controls the internet in such a way that only messages that democrats approve get through shows how desperate and evil democrat leaders have become as the only way that they can get their liberal socialist agenda to the people of OUR Great U.S.ofA. is to control and force feed that info as nation wide for over 15 years fewer and fewer media outlets will broadcast the democrat left wing info as citizens will not support the funding of programs that are left leaning because we see through the lies of the democrat leaders and we do not want the evil agenda of the current democrat leaders, further added the current democrat leaders have wantonly ignored the very large grass roots swelling of U.S.ofA. Citizens that have marched in Washington DC and around the Nation claiming that those Citizens are just a few small angry mobs when we number in the tens of millions, but then as is typical of evil tyrants those tyrants ignore all who disagree and severely punish those that disagree even when those that disagree is most of the nation as is currently the case and the current democrat leaders as do tyrants force their evil agenda regardless of opposition and without letting the opposite party ie us Republicans have anything to say in the matter, those democrats are proving that they are indeed the evil angels living as humans during the last days just before the return of JESUS the CHRIST whom most democrat leaders hate as they are atheists despite the label they apply to themselves,,, so I United States of America Security Agent 001 (I still have that Federal ID) hope you are smart enough to not push through your net neutrality agenda which is not neutral but democrat forced control which has so far worldwide has always been extremely evil and hurt the nations... JESUS CHRIST is my saviour and we will prevail!!!!!! Tim Maine  
Boulder, Colorado

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Lisa Malander  
January 5, 2010, 12:48 pm  
5442 S Richfield Ways  
Centennial, Colorado 80015

Ditto Americans for Prosperity sentiment... LM

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Robert Malcomson  
January 5, 2010, 12:53 pm  
2267 N. Henderson Rd.  
Davison, Michigan 48423

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Philip & Antonette Maldonato  
January 5, 2010, 12:55 pm  
9 Somerset Drive  
Yonkers, New York 10710

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Government STAY OUT OF MY INTERNET!

Steve Mallette  
January 5, 2010, 12:56 pm  
Little Falls Drive  
Concord, North Carolina 28025

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Ok, the standard Americans for Prosperity statement is below. I'll keep it simple:  
"Stay out of regulating the internet - it is outside your charter!"

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Christina Malo  
January 5, 2010, 12:57 pm  
7885 Dove Ln  
Windsor, California 95492

As an Americans for Prosperity supporter, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Robert Malone  
January 5, 2010, 12:59 pm  
1308 Independence Ave N  
Golden Valley, Minnesota 55427

As an American I'm already sick of watching what Liberal losership is doing to this country. Keep your grimy Marxist hands off of the internet you statist jerks.

Mr. R Gerald Malone

rose mandelbaum  
January 5, 2010, 1:01 pm  
5982 royal club dr boynton beach  
boynton beach, Florida 33437

IAs an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Larry Mangan  
January 5, 2010, 1:03 pm  
5554 Wilkerson Pass Drive  
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80917

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In a nutshell, keep the Federal Governments hands, feet and toes out of the Internet!

Mary Weaver Mann  
January 5, 2010, 1:04 pm  
1413 Winchester St.  
Fredericksburg, Virginia 22401

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I am an American citizen. These changes would make my Patriot forebears and relatives who are/were servicemen ROLL OVER IN THEIR GRAVES!

Anne Mansfield  
January 5, 2010, 1:04 pm  
4000 Cathedral Ave, NW 524B  
Washington, District of Columbia 20016

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Mary Mansfield  
January 5, 2010, 1:06 pm  
P.O. Box 1487  
Westhampton Beach, New York 11978

As an American and a retired teacher interested in preserving our freedoms, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Charles Mansfield, Jr.  
January 5, 2010, 1:07 pm  
P.O. Box 1487  
Westhampton Beach, New York 11978

As an American and a former Marine who wishes to preserve our freedoms, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Judith Manuell-Marnell  
January 5, 2010, 1:07 pm  
10258 Old Orchard  
La Porte, Texas 77571

I am not politically savy. I do know that Government takeover is more than just implied in this issue and based on how well our government has handled many government programs, ie FEMA & SOCIAL SECURITY & (possibly) HEALTH, there should be an emphasis on American's to stop this from happening before we become a socialist country, dependent 100% upon Government intervention in every aspect of our lives. For an independant nation filled with proud individuals, this seems truly cock-eyed!

Judith Manuell-Marnell  
January 5, 2010, 1:09 pm  
10258 Old Orchard  
La Porte, Texas 77571

It is amazing to me that America is managed by politicians. Politicians are very good at what they do, politickin' but that does not necessarily make them good managers. This seems quite evident when we look at FEMA, WELFARE, SOCIAL SECURITY, etc , programs managed by our governmental system. I do not want to see our government becoming responsible for another program currently handled in the public sector. For proud Americans, who are independent, stand-on-their-own-two-feet, individuals, we sure have become a nation of mama's boys.

Gary Manzella  
January 5, 2010, 1:11 pm  
501 Red Clay Rd. SW  
Cleveland, Tennessee 37311

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

As such I am opposed to any form of government takeover of the Internet.

Gary Manzella

Tom Marhefki  
January 5, 2010, 1:12 pm  
13 Pattison Court  
Simsbury, Connecticut 6070

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In an administration that seems bent on controlling as much power as possible and with very little desire to listen to the will of the people I feel that the government needs to stop trying to make apparent inroads to interfere with our most basic rights including the first amendment.

Please consider the fact that this administration cares more for power and control and what is good for the party and not, as they would try to make us believe our "best interests".

I am available to answer any inquiry you may have and will gladly stand up and be counted in an effort to destroy this attempt on our constitution.

Anne Markert  
January 5, 2010, 1:12 pm  
37777 Drawbridge Way  
Purcellville, Virginia 20132

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The only reason for doing this, in my opinion, is to dismantle all that is good about America and the capitalist system. That reason, in my opinion, is to eventually overthrow our Country, piece by piece, over time..... until America is no more.

Joan Marks  
January 5, 2010, 1:13 pm  
Bear Valley Springs  
Tehachapi, California 93561

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The Government needs to stick to politics and stay out of the business world and the personal lives of the nation. Congress is getting out of hand and needs to stick to the national security issues of importance, enhancing the economy and job creation, keeping the crooks on Wall Street and the Banking Industry from raping the country.  
YOU WORK FOR US....WE DON'T WORK FOR YOU...GOT IT...IF NOT GET IT.



J. E. Marsden  
January 5, 2010, 1:14 pm  
1351 sommerset Dr.  
Lawrenceville, Georgia 30043

As a VOTING citizen of the United States of America, and a strong supporter of its REPUBLICAN form of government, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Janet Marsh  
January 5, 2010, 1:18 pm  
74 S 360 W  
Orem, Utah 84058

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

WHO DO YOU THINK YOU ARE?

Dale and Patricia Marshall  
January 5, 2010, 1:18 pm  
2415 Aurelius Rd  
#18  
Holt, Michigan 48842

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, we are submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

We are especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,

Glenn Marshall  
January 5, 2010, 1:22 pm  
1419 Elva Dr  
Gallup, New Mexico 87301-5823

I am completely opposed to this proposal.

By means of twisted language you are attempting to further control individuals, taking away personal liberty. Liberties for which our founding fathers fought, bled and died. Liberties for which countremen died in two World Wars.

Less government is always better government!

Sincerely,

Glenn E Marshall

David Marsilia  
January 5, 2010, 1:23 pm  
4400 Memorial Dr #2071  
Houston, Texas 77007

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Open internet, just like net neutrality, is a terrible idea. Our country is vanishing in a maelstrom of government regulations and new self-imposed government powers. The internet is not a public utility, but is rather private property, and should remain so. Do not continue to contribute to the fascist expanse of government infecting our nation's economy. If the FCC seizes control of the internet via "open internet," a serious blow will have been dealt to the future of free speech.

Ed and Pat Martell  
January 5, 2010, 1:23 pm  
45 Washington Ave  
Patchogue, New York 11772

As Americans for Prosperity activists, we are submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

We are especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Eric Martell  
January 5, 2010, 1:27 pm  
9851 Osprey Landing  
Orlando, Florida 32832

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Don't you dare try to exercise or assume control of internet content! This proposed step is a very thinly disguised attempt to exercise control over the last bit of communication territory which remains as free as America used to be. Everyone out "here" knows what your intentions are and we don't like them.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Della Marteny  
January 5, 2010, 1:30 pm  
4003 NE 23 Pl  
Ocala, Florida 34470

NO! to government control of the internet!!!!

regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic it would lose its customers. If government exercises control over the Internet, it will be a MONOPOLY, which is currently ILLEGAL!

The Internet could become crippled without private investors or be “rescued” with TAXPAYER SUBSIDIES IN AN ALREADY OVERBURDENED BUDGET! Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Albert Martin  
January 5, 2010, 1:39 pm  
823 colonia road  
elizabeth, New Jersey 07208/

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

My additions:

I also enjoy photography as a serviou hobby, and realize that sending High Resolution pictures over the web takes up a substantial amount of bandwidth. It certainly takes up mroe bandwith than simple text messaging. I want to have the ability to send pictures over the internet, quality picture and many of them. Currently I have choices of service providers and costs. I can match my usage with costs.

Under "net neutrality" the chances are that the internet provider will become similar to the telephone company many years ago before deregulation: simple and not innovative. I much perfer an internet provider that will innovate. The cost of that could be higher fees. But that is OK. Higher fees for higher service is much more acceptable than standard fees with poor service.

Al Martin

Clare Martin  
January 5, 2010, 1:43 pm  
280 South Ashe Street  
Southern Pines, North Carolina 28387

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Joann Martin  
January 5, 2010, 1:54 pm  
42 Hope Street  
Nutley, New Jersey 7110

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. How dare you infringe on our freedom even more!

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

K Martin  
January 5, 2010, 1:57 pm  
9245 Ridge Rd.  
Goodrich, Michigan 48438

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

L Martin  
January 5, 2010, 1:57 pm  
2314 S. Hiram St.  
Wichita, Kansas 67213

Please consider the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies are in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Patricia Martin  
January 5, 2010, 1:57 pm  
1044 E. Bayview Blvd.  
Norfolk, Virginia 23503

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The government needs to keep away from our Internet! It is not and never has been a utility that needs or welcomes government control...

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

susan Martin  
January 5, 2010, 1:58 pm  
14 Creekside Road  
Hopewell Junction, New York 12533

**KEEP GOVERNMENT AND ITS' REGULATION AWAY FROM THE FREEDOM OF THE INTERNET!!**

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jaren Martineau  
January 5, 2010, 2:03 pm  
1025 E 6th Pl  
Mesa, Arizona 85203

Keep the Internet free. The Internet is a series of private networks connected together for the common good. This is done through voluntary cooperation induced by natural market forces and technology derived through market forces. If we wish to remain competitive, we need to recognize the reason why the Internet has flourished and not make the mistake of destroying it through regulation.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I have been employed as an Internet Network Technician for many years. From my perspective and experience, we need to allow technology and private Internet industries to continue innovation. This innovation is derived from the forces of the market. Keep the Internet free. The Internet is a series of private networks connected together for the common good. This is done through voluntary cooperation induced by natural market forces and technology derived through market forces. If we wish to remain competitive, we need to recognize the reason why the Internet has flourished and not make the mistake of destroying it through regulation.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Sheryl Martinson  
January 5, 2010, 2:05 pm  
8550 W. 90th Ave.  
Westminster, Colorado 80021

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Isn't government in enough stuff without trying to control the internet system as well? Leave something to free enterprise.

Anthony Mascia  
January 5, 2010, 2:07 pm  
360 Somerset St Apt 4  
Stirling, New Jersey 7980

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

To put it another way, since Government proves itself incompetent at virtually everything it attempts to manage, why would we expect any better with this?

Regards

Deon Masker  
January 5, 2010, 2:10 pm  
6848 N. Government Way #114-22  
Dalton Gardens  
Idaho, Idaho 83815

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

**ZIONIST TREASON GOVERNS AMERICA! We do not need it governing the internet!!!!**

Harriett Mason  
January 5, 2010, 2:15 pm  
11101 Lane 7, North  
Mosca, Colorado 81146

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

THE GOVERNMENT NEEDS TO GET OUT AND STAY OUT OF OUR PRIVATE LIVES!!!! THE MAIN FUNCTION AND RESPONSIBILITY OF THE GOVERNMENT IS TO PROTECT THE CITIZENS OF THE UNITED STATES. YOU ARE NOT FULLFILLING THIS RESPONSIBILITY, BECAUSE YOU ARE TOO BUSY TRYING TO RUN OUR LIVES FOR US AND SHOVE YOUR RULES AND REGULATIONS DOWN OUR THROAT. PLEASE STEP BACK, SLOW DOWN ON ALL THESE BILLS YOU ARE TRYING TO SHOVE DOWN OUR THROATS, AND TAKE YOUR JOB SERIOUSLY. PROTECT US FROM THE TERRORISTS AND LET US HAVE OUR INTERNET AS WE HAVE IT NOW!!!!!!.

Sheryl Massey  
January 5, 2010, 2:21 pm  
3420 Spruce Dr. N.  
Mandan, North Dakota 58554

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If the government exercises control over the Internet, there will be no place to turn for private access.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. The free market needs to be maintained. The proposed restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become in the free market.

Claudia Masters  
January 5, 2010, 2:25 pm  
2612 W 107th Pl  
Westminster, Colorado 80234

Please keep government control of the internet out of our communication system!!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Peter Matarangas  
January 5, 2010, 2:29 pm  
625 Blackmore Court  
Marco Island, Florida 34145

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

D MATEJOWSKY  
January 5, 2010, 2:31 pm  
10000 RICHMOND AVE #2  
HOUSTON, Texas 77042-4200

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. "Hands off" government!

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House ill-adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert (Blockhead) McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Dorothy Mathias  
January 5, 2010, 2:35 pm  
3220 chowen Ave. N.  
Robbinsdale, Minnesota 55422-3246

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

A transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Shirley Matney  
January 5, 2010, 2:41 pm  
5191 Falls Rd.  
Lewisburg, Ohio 45338

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Julie Mattern  
January 5, 2010, 2:42 pm  
5220 South Brandon Street  
Seattle, Washington 98118

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Deborah Matthai  
January 5, 2010, 2:53 pm  
1818 S.Shore Dr.  
Holland, Michigan 49423

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely, Deborah Matthai

Paul Maxwell  
January 5, 2010, 2:53 pm  
5358 Timmons Ave  
Memphis, Tennessee 38119

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Wilbur Maxwell  
January 5, 2010, 2:54 pm  
904 W Utica St  
Broken Arrow, Oklahoma 74011

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

**STAY OUT< THE GOV" T HAS ALREADY MESSED UP ENOUGH THINGS!!!!**

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

jannie may  
January 5, 2010, 2:56 pm  
590 N.W. Aspen Ave.  
cedaredge, Colorado 81413

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. If government takes over the internet I and others will stop using it. That would save me over \$40 a month.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Kevin May  
January 5, 2010, 2:57 pm  
1281 Fonterra Way  
Carson City, Nevada 89701

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Free markets.  
Less government regulation.  
Remember the 1st Amendment?



Richard May  
January 5, 2010, 2:59 pm  
816 Duncan Place  
Manhattan Bch., California 90266

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I vote and influence others and we are now watching your actions.

Todd Mayer  
January 5, 2010, 3:00 pm  
722 N Golden Hills  
Wichita, Kansas 67212

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jeff Mayers  
January 5, 2010, 3:02 pm  
1600 Pennsylvania Ave  
Washington, District of Columbia 12345

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The internet is not and should not be a "Public utility." To say that all traffic is equal just shows us that the powers that be have no idea what kind of traffic runs over the internet. If you want to give a granny's 14 word email to her grandson the same priority as a videoconference between two hospitals that are trying to save the life of a newborn baby then we are truly in trouble. Traffic on the internet has priorities just like everything else in life and if you can't see that, then you are as clueless as they come. I work in IT and I understand that certain types of traffic need priority over others. Voice and video traffic are very sensitive kinds of traffic and if they are broken into too many pieces, nothing comes out as it should. Data traffic will get there but when it comes to hearing a voice and seeing a face, a garbled sound and pixelated face just won't cut it. The big bad government didn't invent the internet so what makes it think it can just say to us move over, we know better than you and can run it better than you. If the government thinks it can do better, then let it come up with its own ideas and pay for them with its own money and stop using mine.

Stop trying to force your will on us and let us think for ourselves as we have done for hundreds of years. If you want to see what really happens when a government runs the internet, just take a gander over the pacific at China and if that is what you want for us, then just move over there and leave us alone. They have no original ideas so they have to steal ours.  
Thanks.

Holly Mayfield  
January 5, 2010, 3:03 pm  
776 East 30th South  
Wellington, Kansas 67152

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The internet should not become a government-controlled Utility . . .

Any leanings in that direction should most definitely be debated in Congress and not left to a "commission."

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I resent the continued blatant "power grab" over private entities. Leave the private entities alone . . .

Sincerely,

Holly Mayfield

Michelle Mayhan  
January 5, 2010, 3:04 pm  
14595 Olde Hwy. 80, #21  
El Cajon, California 92021

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive, and should remain so. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If any private company were to block or censor Internet traffic maliciously, it would lose its customers. However, if government were to exercise that kind of control over the Internet, there would be no place left for Internet users to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense, and would therefore not be undertaken. As demand for Internet capacity continued to grow, the lack of corresponding capacity construction would cripple the Internet.

As a result of such government intervention, the Internet would either remain crippled or would be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring further government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the outcome desired by many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not take it upon itself to set into motion any regulatory changes that would force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted (i.e., dismissed entirely). In the absence of concrete evidence of clearly discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no legitimate rationale for imposing new regulations that would almost surely slow down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly-regulated, highly-competitive Internet has become.

Eileen Mays  
January 5, 2010, 3:04 pm  
14380 Susana Ct  
Moreno Valley, California 92553

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Keep the Government out of it!

James Mc Quillan  
January 5, 2010, 3:07 pm  
410 Azalea Drive  
Hampstead, North Carolina 28443

As an American citizen in good standing (i.e. taxpayer since 1959) I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections.

Believe me, as a cable subscriber since 1973 (Poukeepsie, NY) I am not a big fan of cable companies but I feel compelled to write because if a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James Mc Quillan  
January 5, 2010, 3:10 pm  
410 Azalea Drive  
Hampstead, North Carolina 28443

As a taxpaying American citizen I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Patricia McBride  
January 5, 2010, 3:15 pm  
416 W. Hallock Hollow Rd.  
Edelstein, Illinois 61526

Let it be understood from the getgo that any type of public medium that government gets its hands on, will be corrupted.  
Period!  
eg. PBS, NPR

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Chris McCalla  
January 5, 2010, 3:19 pm  
259 Lantern Lane  
Ellerslie, Georgia 31807

As private citizen, tax payer, and consumer, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Michael McClere  
January 5, 2010, 3:19 pm  
28332 Timber Oaks Ct.  
Magnolia, Texas 77355

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Gary McClung  
January 5, 2010, 3:20 pm  
159 Whippany rd.  
Whippany, New Jersey 7981

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

David McConeghey  
January 5, 2010, 3:24 pm  
1507 W Browning Ct  
Andover, Kansas 67002

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Gerald McConnell  
January 5, 2010, 3:27 pm  
66 Hemlock Haven  
Hampton, New Hampshire 3842

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The Internet has come a long ways without unnecessary government intervention. As with everything, it works better when government isn't involved. Please let it remain a good productive tool for mankind; DONT' SCREW IT UP

Norene McCormick  
January 5, 2010, 3:32 pm  
10300 Cogswell Ave.  
10300 Cogswell Ave.  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89134

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jill McCracken  
January 5, 2010, 3:34 pm  
471 Hawthorne Place  
Morganville, New Jersey 7751

Regarding GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Keep your hands OFF the Internet.  
Period.

You may not regulate it, tax it, control it, moderate it or in any other way consider it within your jurisdiction.

KEEP YOUR HANDS Off OF THE INTERNET.



John McCracken  
January 5, 2010, 3:39 pm  
142 W. Patrick St.  
Gilbert, Arizona 85233

Socialized healthcare, federally funded abortion, gun control, Copenhagen crap and fake agreement, czars that believe your hamster can sue you, giving praise to chairman Mao, giving billions to crooked financial institutions then scolding THEIR actions after signing the check, buying votes on what the people as a whole emphatically dislike, labeling all of those who like to disagree with policy domestic terrorists, attempting to implement failed practices of other cultures and embracing the wrong people internationally while turning their backs on our allies. No wonder the state controlled media demonizes you "right wingers" all the time. There is no place for values in this agenda. On 09-08-09 the next generation of voters were told not to rebel against the boundaries, along with the constitution they are being removed by a congress and senate who appear to be hearing impaired. Treason is a good description for all of this and in this election we need some "incumbent cleansing". Don't ask for advice from an ivy league graduate, ask a human being. Can you mail me one of those NYC heroin users instruction manuals??? Thanks.

John McCracken  
(of the new tired and poor)

Kenneth and Marsha McElreath  
January 5, 2010, 3:51 pm  
P.O. Box 124  
Mt. Vernon, Iowa 52314

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Scott McElroy  
January 5, 2010, 3:56 pm  
14711 W 47th St S  
Clearwater, Kansas 67026-9048

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank you for your time.

Melissa McFarland  
January 5, 2010, 4:06 pm  
7513 East Whistling Wind Way  
7513 East Whistling Wind Way  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85255

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jean McGonigal  
January 5, 2010, 4:08 pm  
23891 Meadow Dr. NE  
Aurora, Oregon 97002

As an American I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Gail McHenry  
January 5, 2010, 4:10 pm  
6252 McKinney Hollow Road  
Eagle Rock, Virginia 24085

You may get these comments a lot, I hope so. But please don't mistake a "prefilled form" with a lack of conviction. Government already has TOO MUCH to do as it is. PLEASE let the internet alone!!!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This country is being turned into something that, when you stop and look at it, you'll be ashamed and saddened. Please look before it's too late!

God bless America!!

JOHN McILHANEY  
January 5, 2010, 4:11 pm  
203 KENMAR DRIVE  
YORKTOWN, Virginia 23692

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I strongly oppose this proposed rule.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jane McIntosh  
January 5, 2010, 4:11 pm  
346 Silent Brook Trail  
Jacksonville, Florida 32225

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

**STOP TAKING OVER THE PRIVATE SECTOR IN THIS COUNTRY!!**

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



George McKenzie  
January 5, 2010, 4:17 pm  
9615 W. 98th St.  
Overland Park, Kansas 66212

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The open internet rule is stupid. Knock it off.

George McKenzie  
January 5, 2010, 4:18 pm  
9615 W. 98th St.  
Overland Park, Kansas 66212

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The open internet rule is stupid. Knock it off.

Oal Lee McKenzie  
January 5, 2010, 4:25 pm  
1309 Grove PT RD  
Wilmington, North Carolina 28409

Stop Net Neutrality or Open Internet!! No more takeovers of public business and crativity!! Congress are you listening? Mr Obama are you listening? FCC are you listening? NO TAKEOVER NO REGULATION NO TAXATION!  
Let capitalism alone and get back to the Republic of th USA!

We are watching!

Clay McKinney  
January 5, 2010, 4:27 pm  
305 Jackson Rd  
Dickson, Tennessee 37055

I am the owner of BANG! Web Development, and have been professionally involved with the Internet for 12 years.

As an independant libertarian/conservative activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

David McKinnon  
January 5, 2010, 4:28 pm  
6707 Alta Vista Drive  
Rancho Palos Verdes, California 90275

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

A transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

There is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations on the the lightly regulated, competitive Internet -- a proven, great engine of innovation, growth, and expression.

Ralph McKnight  
January 5, 2010, 4:31 pm  
2308 Marthasville Court  
Stone Mountain, Georgia 30087

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I am tired of our representatives not representing us. So far this administration has come inches close to treason. If it ever reaches that point, the only action to that betraying is firing squad. I hope it doesn't come to that, but there are millions that have already called for that in this administration. Fact!

We will be watching, and we wont take the lies and midnight closed door deals sitting down anymore.

James G. McMahon  
January 5, 2010, 4:39 pm  
508 S Longfield Ave  
Sherwood, Arkansas 72120

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Roger McMillin  
January 5, 2010, 4:40 pm  
12695 Fellowship Way  
Reno, Nevada 89511

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

For many senior citizens this is their preferred method of communicating with relatives and friends. Censorship would for the most part eliminate their freedom to communicate.



Susanna McNeil  
January 5, 2010, 4:40 pm  
1641 N. Vine St.  
Chicago, Illinois 60614

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please adhere to the same principle that guides our health care providers: First, do no harm. Please cease and desist in this effort to take over the Internet.

David B McNeill (public)  
January 5, 2010, 4:41 pm  
2412 Scouting Trail  
2412 Scouting Trail  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27615

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and the founder of the perversely-named “Free Press.”

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. Setting into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path is at the very best disingenuous to the notion of open and public debate, and at worst yet another illegal socialist move by this joke of an administration. Such an action flies in the face of promoting the general welfare, as defined by the Constitution. I also read it as an attempt to thwart the Fifth Amendment (takings) protections afforded by the Constitution.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. The market is the best arbiter, period, end of story.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Andrea McNew  
January 5, 2010, 4:50 pm  
2302 Apion Court  
Paso Robles, California 93446

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I strongly believe in the rights of the people, the values of the Constitution, and less government interference in the workings of the free enterprise system. Stop spending. Stay out of private business. Listen to the voices of the American People.  
Thank you, Andrea L. McNew

Dolly McRea  
January 5, 2010, 4:57 pm  
9615 W Willowbrook Drive  
Sun City, Arizona 85373

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I find this to be a another way of gaining control over the lives of people.....

D.Mcrea

Matthew McReynolds  
January 5, 2010, 5:03 pm  
5920 SW 205th Ave.  
Aloha, Oregon 97007

As an "Americans for Prosperity" activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sandi McReynolds  
January 5, 2010, 5:05 pm  
30084 Grapevine Lane  
Carl Junction, Missouri 64834

I respectfully submit the following regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is, and should remain, highly competitive. There is no justification for imposing new regulations that would unquestionably slow the impetus of innovation, growth, and expression that the competitive Internet has become. I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately assume authority for which competing interests should be prioritized.

The proposed burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent the free development of business models that may be economically efficient, impose uncertainty in the market, and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investment in building network capacity, discouraging further investment and crippling the growth of the internet. This appears to be a desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, such as former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney, since it would put the internet into position to be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, inevitably bringing government control and politicization along with government ownership. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers; however, if government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no other options available.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, our legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not arrogate to itself regulatory changes that will force us down this path and restrict the freedom of the internet.

Katrina Meade  
January 5, 2010, 5:06 pm  
24 Stanford Court #12  
Irvine, California 92673

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

All of these measures continue to erode the our nation by changing ideals, corruption, lowering standards, silliness and harmful greed. The decent members of the public are increasingly becoming less protected, as the corrupt majority, taking over by sheer numbers and a rapidly increasing population of citizens of a different ethical character. Those who continue to increase our population with no parental accountability, crime and sloth are taking over in numbers and demand the state's economical support. Our courts and legislature take private kickbacks in their pocket from oil, drugs, and corrupt banking. Despite the false rhetoric to create a misleading public perception that we are getting out of a heinous, uncalled for war, and getting the lobbyists out of Washington, we are dragged into more war for the self serving corporate vulcher lobbies that run Washington. Actually, the opposite of what is promised is happening. Also, the healthcare measure is another example of this government takeover. The government operated entities are wasteful, and the least efficient. The only thing our Congress does is secure their pensions and vote based on kickbacks, which they seem to increasingly be spending on wine and women. Porn on the internet makes more money than any other industry, as I was an employee at Microsoft. The government, as with the poppy market in Afghanistan will increasingly make sure that these undisclosed markets thrive \$. The healthcare measure is all about giving rights to those that sit around, and reallocating things to those that are favored. Decent people are discriminated against. Everybody will receive C care, and nobody will get A care. This will result in the certain secret intended result of population control-esp. of the old. Instead, let's allow the criminals, molesters and parentally unaccountable babymakers to thrive by access to healthcare just because they're young. What is America doing to protect the hard-working decent folks. There is no proportionality in the system anymore between your toil and reward. The sitter arounders will get everything handed on a platter, taking out the critical incentive in the system to work. But, Obama and Pelosi will receive the most elite care. If they believe this is going to be quality care they should agree to be receive the same health care that everybody else is. This would never happen. They don't truly care about the suffering of good people, as long as they're taken care of, they will take away the hard working middle class' quality care.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Katrina Meade  
January 5, 2010, 5:07 pm  
2 Stanford Court #12  
Irvine, California 92673

Katrina has just sent a comment. Her well being is being tracked should anything happen to her based on her previous comments. An attorney in Newport Beach has tracked and recorded these comments and will expose the incident should the current administration try to take her out or harm her in any way for her comments. We are living in times where people like Larry Sinclair were hurt. Perception and dumbing up the public are the goals of modern government. What happened to the quality and character our forefathers fought to protect.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Edi Meadwos  
January 5, 2010, 5:08 pm  
2210 Dogwood Circle  
Mount Dora, Florida 32757

Government needs to stay out of business, as long as no laws are being broken.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

mary meagher  
January 5, 2010, 5:10 pm  
2850 Creekside Dr.  
santa Rosa, California 95405

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Loretta Meier  
January 5, 2010, 5:12 pm  
3467 West Delhi Rd  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103

As an American I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is a highly competitive, amazing tool of communication and innovation and education. Endless possibilities open up unless it is taken over and regulated, taxed, or jeopardized by government intervention.

Keep the internet free from government intervention and monopolizing the communications market. This bill is not a step for freedom and can not be hidden under language that promotes neutrality but seeks control and limitation.

Please remember that government is FOR THE PEOPLE and the internet serves the people and should not be ruled to death!  
Keep the internet free and open!

Lesa Melaugh  
January 5, 2010, 5:13 pm  
8119 Poe Ct  
Jacksonville, Florida 32244

As a 912 Project member, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Peggy melfi  
January 5, 2010, 5:13 pm  
9541 High Free Pike  
West jefferson, Ohio 43162

Enough with the control of a FREE people, already!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Anthony Meller  
January 5, 2010, 5:14 pm  
50870 Coventry Ct  
Elkhart, Indiana 46514

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank-you for your time,

Mr. Anthony Meller

Linda Melton  
January 5, 2010, 5:16 pm  
7068 Sunburst Way  
Citrus Heights, California 95621

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, the following is my comment about preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. IHowever, if the federal government were to exercise control over the Internet, there would be no alternative.

The suggested burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unrealistically restrictive and would essentially eliminate business practices that would well be economically efficient, thus imposing uncertainty and creating opportunity for expensive litigation. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would be rendered crippled and, most likely, have to be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, resulting in yet additional government control and politicization as well as government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress with extensive involvement of and participation by the American public. The Commission should not unilaterally inflict regulatory changes that will force result in the Internet freedom that currently exists and serves its stakeholders quite well.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of the alleged “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of substantive evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there exists not legitimate evidence to validate the imposition of new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

JoAn Mende  
January 5, 2010, 5:29 pm  
4051 Meridian  
Addison, Michigan 49220

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Doesnt our administration have enough on their plate to resolve, fix and restore, than to entertain creating new regulations on internet use?



Ruth Merrill  
January 5, 2010, 5:30 pm  
4953 Eastridge Lane #144  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84117

Although the following comment was written for me, I am definitely in agreement with what it says. I am certain that government regulations in most cases lead to higher cost and less efficiency. The only time this is not the case is when a monopoly exists. I know if no evidence that this is the case with the internet. I also know that government regulations in many cases actually contribute to the ability of one company to create a monopoly. Therefore, I support the following comment.

Ruth Merrill

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Robert Merryman  
January 5, 2010, 5:34 pm  
P.O.Box 717  
Rio Grande, New Jersey 8242

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

America does NOT need Joseph Goebbels in charge of the Internet. People and businesses NEED and WANT the Internet totally FREE and totally unhindered as an avenue of FREE and OPEN DISCUSSION!! We don't need cute terms that sound good like “internet neutrality” and “Open Internet” which are really code terms for BIG BROTHER GOVERNMENT regulation. “That government is BEST which Governs LEAST” -enough said!!

William Mertens  
January 5, 2010, 5:38 pm  
2378 Meadowdown Dr.  
Owosso, Michigan 48867

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In a nutshell, the less government intervention in our lives the better!

Gary Messano  
January 5, 2010, 5:40 pm  
679 Granite Cliff  
San Antonio, Texas 78251

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Oh and by the way, THIS IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL!!!!!!

Larry Meyer  
January 5, 2010, 5:44 pm  
3308 E Main  
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49048

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Larry M. Meyer ARS-WD8KWK

George Meyers  
January 5, 2010, 5:45 pm  
1307 N. Wisconsin St  
Racine, Wisconsin 53402

The Internet must remain open and free. Yes, I understand there are some risks with this. That is always the case with freedom.

But the advantages far outweigh the risks.

I am sure that you see things in government that you don't like. Right now the Internet is the very best opportunity we have to uncover those things. Nothing else has ever worked and never will.

Whistle Blowers are hardly heard of any more.

The Internet is our Whistle Blower. Look what happened to the corruption in England with the Global Warming issue. It was the Internet that set those liars on the defense.

You will not want to live in a country whose government has the power to control communications and the Internet.

Jacquelynn Meyers  
January 5, 2010, 5:47 pm  
1307 N. Wisconsin Street  
Racine, Wisconsin 53402

As an American I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

b michael  
January 5, 2010, 5:48 pm  
1830 westover ave  
petersburg, Virginia 23805

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.  
Do NOT do this!



Pat Michael  
January 5, 2010, 5:56 pm  
4120 shetland Dr  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please consider the impact of this on our country. We are FREE, anyone can listen/read or not listen/read whatever they like. We Have CHOICE in America. How dare one group think They can control everyone else. Trials for treason are not far off.

Ted Michorczyk  
January 5, 2010, 6:01 pm  
600 Cedar Knoll Court  
Roswell, Georgia 30076

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Come on Congress, get a handle on "common sense", this bill is ridiculous !!

Guy Miconi  
January 5, 2010, 6:04 pm  
10316 Greenwood Place  
Oakton, Virginia 22124

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Let's stop this nonsense now.

James Midgley  
January 5, 2010, 6:10 pm  
2608 Stone Creek Dr  
Plano, Texas 75075

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Whenever the government has undertaken to "solve a problem" it has only made it worse. How absurd to interject the government into an area where there is not even a problem. Please LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE!

Mark Midkiff  
January 5, 2010, 6:23 pm  
1101 NW 40th Ave  
Coconut Creek, Florida 33066

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Edward Mike  
January 5, 2010, 6:29 pm  
17711 10th Ave Marion MI  
Marion, Michigan 49665

Stop trying to hijack Free Speech. As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Amy Mikula  
January 5, 2010, 6:30 pm  
2713 Sutherland Dr  
Thompsons Station, Tennessee 37179

STOP trying to socialize this country!!!!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Cory Mikula  
January 5, 2010, 6:34 pm  
2713 Sutherland Drive  
Thompsons Station, Tennessee 37179

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Dennis Miley  
January 5, 2010, 6:36 pm  
1907 Pollock St  
Fredericksburg, Virginia 22405

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Leave ur internet alone!

Christopher C Miller  
January 5, 2010, 6:40 pm  
9104 Fieldcrest Walk  
Covington, Georgia 30014

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Leave our First Amendment rights alone!

Clark Miller  
January 5, 2010, 6:41 pm  
2017 E. Yeargin Dr  
Fresno, California 93720

The government needs to get of the business of making everything its business. Hands off the Internet, the greatest frontier of information transmission and dissemination in human history. Let the risk-takers, markets and consumers decide what will prevail. Gov't regulation leads to stagnation and stifles true innovation. Any attempt to insert gov't bureaucracy is another veiled attempt to erode our constitutinal rights to free speech and assembly. "Don't tread on me" once again needs to become the rallying cry for Americans resisting the restrictions our so called leaders continously seek to impose.

Back off  
Hands off  
Laissez-faire  
Don't read on me

Karen Miller  
January 5, 2010, 6:43 pm  
11322 Western Avenue  
Cedarburg, Wisconsin 53012

Regarding GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Keep your hands off our internet. There is absolutely no plausible reason why our government politicians and beauracracy should control it. Regardless of how you might try to spin it, we all know this is merely an attempt to take it over. How dare you!

Kevin Miller  
January 5, 2010, 6:44 pm  
50 West Main St.  
Apt.11B1  
Uniontown, Pennsylvania 15401

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I'd also like to add my 14 cents to this letter.I have  
no way of affording searching the Worldwide Web because  
1.I don't have a plastic card 2.My Banking account's budget is limited and..3.I just shouldn't have to! It was intended  
to be free for searching and it needs to STAY that way.  
The 1st Ammendment in our Constitution garauntees our  
Freedom Of Speech and it shouldn't be tossed away like  
yesterday's garbage.Please leave my Internet Alone!

larry miller  
January 5, 2010, 7:01 pm  
5312 old town lane  
gastonia, North Carolina 28056

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We already have "state-run" propaganda in NPR and PBS - financed off the tax payer. There is no issue with free speech and trying to create an issue with the internet is absurd and must be stopped.

Larry Miller

Michael Miller  
January 5, 2010, 7:02 pm  
11136 Geyer Downs Lane  
St. Louis, Missouri 63131

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Stephen Miller  
January 5, 2010, 7:03 pm  
156 Otis Avenue  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55104

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

ENFORCE CONTROL OF CONTROL PORNOGRAPHY, NOT THE INTERNET. The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Sean Millichamp  
January 5, 2010, 7:04 pm  
19630 Hickory Leaf St  
Southfield, Michigan 48076

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mark Milliman  
January 5, 2010, 7:07 pm  
4080 Greens Place  
Longmont, Colorado 80503

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

As a builder of last-mile broadband networks, I am vehemently opposed to any regulation of the Internet that would limit service provider's ability to deliver quality, reliable, innovative services. Network operators need the ability to offer differentiated services without restriction, regulation, or other intervention. The current FCC proposal will prohibit the offering of those services. All bits are not created equal as many filings have pointed out.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense and inhibit the development of broadband services in underserved and unserved areas.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. This paragraph extends beyond the Commission's authority.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The bottom line is that if it ain't broke, don't fix it and it ain't broke!

Sincerely Yours,  
Mark Milliman

Andrew Miner  
January 5, 2010, 7:09 pm  
11203 SE 267th Pl  
Kent, Washington 98030

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility would end up with a disastrously crippled service as all such government utilities have become (e.g., Amtrack).

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mary Minshall  
January 5, 2010, 7:24 pm  
5575 N. Simmons Ave., Ste 1  
PMB 120  
North Las Vegas, Nevada 89031

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In conclusion, the last thing anyone of us needs is more government intrusion into the private sector where the Internet belongs.

Keith Minty  
January 5, 2010, 7:31 pm  
4308 Hatch Street  
N. Las Vegas, Nevada 89032

As a concerned American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jennifer Mitchell  
January 5, 2010, 7:33 pm  
1514 9th Street  
Bedford, Indiana 47421

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Keep the internet public. We do not want government control, especially Socialist or Communist government, NO GOVERNMENT CONTROL!!!

Verle and Christine Mitchell  
January 5, 2010, 7:35 pm  
61300 King Solomon Lane  
Bend, Oregon 97702-2810

What are you thinking about and what are you trying to do? What would happen to you if someone else were in power and didn't like what you were saying so they shut you up! As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Winston Mitchell  
January 5, 2010, 7:40 pm  
PO Box 529  
Seaside, Oregon 97138

Tyrants abound in any age. The Founding Fathers sternly warned Americans of whatever era to avoid anything corresponding to a tyranny of kings, e.g. unknown, unaccountable czars answerable only to the chief executive. Obama has turned increasingly to that power grab ignobly pressed by GW Bush along with signing statements. American freedom has had to renew itself through the blood and sacrifice of those who love this nation and limited constitutional government. The Constitution and Federalism are increasingly shredded by charlatans in and out of government while paying it lip service. We must strongly reject this inroad on our freedoms if we are to be worthy of citizenship in this "last best hope of freedom."

Accordingly, as an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Tom Mittler  
January 5, 2010, 7:42 pm  
9302 Bayberry Lane  
Tinley Park, Illinois 60487

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thomas Mittler

Robert Mizell  
January 5, 2010, 7:43 pm  
7400 Cienega NW  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87120

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

What this administration wants to do using the FCC as the vehicle to the free flow of information on the internet is akin to what Hugo Chavez did and is doing in Venezuela. Assert control of all forums that make available the expression of thought and ideas that differ from theirs.

Stephan Moen  
January 5, 2010, 7:44 pm  
848 Wine Cellar Cir  
Wilmington, North Carolina 28411

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Internet providers should be able to "prioritize" certain uses, either through higher prices or in association with selected priorities such as crisis management, law enforcement, national security, medical uses--but at their discretion. So long as all people have access to the internet at whatever fair price the service requires (assuming a competitive and level-field marketplace), the market will develop capabilities and allocate resources most efficiently to provide the desired services and yet provide a good reward for those who innovate and risk to develop and enhance the internet.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Frederick Moessner  
January 5, 2010, 7:48 pm  
102 Crossington Way  
Fountain Inn, South Carolina 29644-7901

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet.

GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Deborah Mohler  
January 5, 2010, 7:55 pm  
16106 Lake Drive West  
Vance, Mississippi 39565

As a Free at the moment American Citizen and an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Charles Molling  
January 5, 2010, 8:07 pm  
141 Rainbow Drive, #4170  
Livingston, Texas 77399-1041

Keep your GD hands off the Internet which is today's press and should be covered under freedom of the press.

Victoria Mongold  
January 5, 2010, 8:11 pm  
3920 Holsinger Rd  
Broadway, Virginia 22815

As an Americans for Prosperity supporter, I share the sentiments written below, regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Pamela Monnier  
January 5, 2010, 8:11 pm  
129 Main Street  
POB 23  
York Springs, Pennsylvania 17372

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Rick Monroe  
January 5, 2010, 8:21 pm  
11138 Pinehurst Dr.  
Austin, Texas 78747

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. After all, this is not 1939, Germany.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated and rejected in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ray Montgomery  
January 5, 2010, 8:22 pm  
1105 Railroad Ave #248  
Bellingham, Washington 9825

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

There is nothing wrong with any of the communications systems in the United States. The U.S. government has no business "helping" these private companies in any way. Fairness, quality of service and freedom can only be guaranteed by a free and unfettered market. Please end all the initiatives currently in progress that advocate government intervention in the private business of U.S. citizens.

Included below is the text from the Americans for Prosperity web site with which I wholeheartedly agree:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ronald T. Moody  
January 5, 2010, 8:26 pm  
11908 Highway 212  
Marshall, North Carolina 28753

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.  
Just Remember I Vote! and I Count.

James Mooney  
January 5, 2010, 8:28 pm  
2440 E. Hale St.  
Mesa, Arizona 85213

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Michael Mooney  
January 5, 2010, 8:32 pm  
36902 Bayside Drive  
Fenwick Island, Delaware 19944

As an American citizen, and an enthusiastic supporter of our freedoms, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. This would be an outrageous violation of our freedoms!

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James Moore  
January 5, 2010, 8:36 pm  
41 Punzante Way  
Hot Springs Village, Arkansas 71909

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I subscribe to and am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jeff Moore  
January 5, 2010, 8:37 pm  
3065 NE Saber Dr  
Bend, Oregon 97701

As an Internet user and Network Engineer, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Lynn Moore  
January 5, 2010, 8:39 pm  
409 Horton Drive  
Port Gibson, Mississippi 39150

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Charles Moran  
January 5, 2010, 8:45 pm  
5482 Red Fox Dr  
Brighton, Michigan 48114

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. I would consider the regulating of the internet as an encroachment to my free speech rights per the First Article of the Constitution.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James Moreland  
January 5, 2010, 8:50 pm  
1668 West Ash Dr.  
Avon, Ohio 44011

As a concerned internet user and unabashed capitalist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Matt Morgan  
January 5, 2010, 8:52 pm  
4510 Medical Center Dr Ste 204  
McKinney, Texas 75069

This is in regards to GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

David Morris  
January 5, 2010, 8:53 pm  
12513 Church St. #8  
Birch Run, Michigan 48415

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Government control of the internet, or any other private sector communication medium is clearly a violation of the 1st Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Thomas Morse  
January 5, 2010, 8:54 pm  
1628 Jacobsen Road  
Neenah, Wisconsin 54956-1104

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jack Moses Jr.  
January 5, 2010, 8:55 pm  
16076 Howard Dr.  
Macomb, Michigan 48042

As an American taxpayer, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mary A. Moss  
January 5, 2010, 9:02 pm  
1530 Northaven Drive  
Allen, Texas 75002

**STOP TRYING TO CONTROL EVERY ASPECT OF OUR LIVES! YOU SHOULD BE ASHAMED OF YOURSELVES FOR YOUR BAD BEHAVIOR. THIS COUNTRY IS ABOUT FREEDOM - NOT CONTROL BY THE GOVERNMENT! WHAT IS WRONG WITH YOU PEOPLE?**

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

C. C. Motes  
January 5, 2010, 9:06 pm  
6174 McGinnis Ferry Road #301  
Alpharetta, Georgia 30005

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please leave our internet alone. It works just fine as it is. After all, Al Gore invented it!!!



Richard Mozey  
January 5, 2010, 9:15 pm  
15915 Stratton Park Drive  
Spring, Texas 77379

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should not even be considered. If anything it should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sharon Mulawa  
January 5, 2010, 9:39 pm  
29851 Quinkert  
Roseville, Michigan 48066

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I believe in limited government and freedom for the poople. The government should only be involved in those dutys specified in the constitution. Control of communications and the stifling of free speech is unamerican.

Terry Mulawa  
January 5, 2010, 9:48 pm  
29851 Quinkert  
Roseville, Michigan 48066

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I believe in freedom and free markets. The government takeover of the economy and the internet is unamerican. I am deeply concerned about this administrations desire for central control of the American people.

Bill Mullins  
January 5, 2010, 10:06 pm  
1804 Glengarry Dr.  
Carrollton, Texas 75006

Keep government out of the internet.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Bill Mullins  
January 5, 2010, 10:07 pm  
1804 Glengarry Dr.  
Carrollton, Texas 75006

Keep government out of the internet.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Michael Mulready  
January 5, 2010, 10:16 pm  
4925 Cliff Point Circle East  
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80919

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ted Munger  
January 5, 2010, 10:25 pm  
1127 Bel Air Drive  
Allen, Texas 75013

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Rene Munoz  
January 5, 2010, 10:25 pm  
3809 Bissonet Drive  
Metairie, Louisiana 70003

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. We are the land of the brave and the free, we dont need any form of a nanny state. Leave us alone.



Rene Munoz  
January 5, 2010, 10:32 pm  
3809 Bissonet Drive  
Metairie, Louisiana 70003

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. We are the land of the brave and the free, we don't need any form of a nanny state. Leave us alone.

eddie munsey  
January 5, 2010, 10:43 pm  
820 douglad dr  
rogersville, Tennessee 37857

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I will be waiting for you to show up at the house.

David Munson  
January 5, 2010, 10:51 pm  
9446 70th St.  
Kenosha, Wisconsin 53142

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Read the Novel "1984" - I am not going to let you get away with your dirty tactics to undermine our freedoms & control almost every aspect of our lives.

Beware the Voter Backlash !!

Sincerely !!

Roy Munzel  
January 5, 2010, 10:51 pm  
351 N. Squirrel Rd Lot 213  
Auburn Hills, Michigan 48326

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Roy E. Munzel

Pamela Murdoch  
January 5, 2010, 11:12 pm  
165 Ketton Crossing  
Johns Creek, Georgia 30097

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Daniel Murphey  
January 5, 2010, 11:34 pm  
7 Caranza Ave.  
Evansville, Indiana 47710

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I, Daniel Murphey, believe and support all that has been said in this message. It seems as if the leadership of our country thinks that if we become like China in every other respect we will also have their wealth.

Paul Murphy  
January 5, 2010, 11:37 pm  
9126 Belton Bend Ct.  
Cypress, Texas 77433

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I would sincerely hate to see the internet become the post office. Absent the ability of companies to control their investment to maximize their customer's satisfaction and maximize their own profits, companies will not invest the capital required to pave the "dirt road" we now have. That would leave government control as the only option and we should all know where that leads.

"Net neutrality" is a stupid idea. It does not matter too much if a file download is slowed down to better manage traffic, but slow down a live video and it becomes unwatchable. Different data streams have very different requirements. Treating them all the same simply will not work unless bandwidth is unlimited.

Jackie Murray  
January 5, 2010, 11:39 pm  
40 Underpass Rd.  
Plummer, Idaho 83851

We The People know the real reason you guys want to regulate the internet! you want to work in secrecy to prevent Americans from finding out what shenanigans you are up to in real time. What are you trying to protect us from? Free speech.



Rick Murray  
January 5, 2010, 11:40 pm  
2414 SW Salmon Ave.  
Redmond, Oregon 97756

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I, as the sender of this message, agree completely with the statements set forth here and am opposed to gov't intervention or control of content and technologies.

Carl Muschweck  
January 6, 2010, 12:37 am  
1981 SW McAllister Lane  
Port St Lucie, Florida 34953

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Holly Musgrave  
January 6, 2010, 1:01 am  
1525 E. Elmwood Cir  
Mesa, Arizona 85203

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely, Holly Musgrave, Concerned Citizen

Donald Musgrove  
January 6, 2010, 1:12 am  
15520 Collier run rd.  
Cumberland, Maryland 21502

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Donald K. Musgrove

Dalen Muster  
January 6, 2010, 1:22 am  
1060 South st #14  
Redding, California 96001

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am absolutely against government run communications. (internet, phone, etc.) Hands Off! Free market is working, always has and if you guys screw this up I'll be one of the taxpayers paying for it. No, No, No!  
Dalen Muster

Theodore Myers  
January 6, 2010, 3:59 am  
5758 E. Ironwood Dr.  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85266-6728

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I totally oppose all government involvement or regulation of the internet. Free speech must be preserved.

Theodore Myers  
January 6, 2010, 4:00 am  
5758 E. Ironwood Dr.  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85266-6728

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I totally oppose all government involvement or regulation of the internet. Free speech must be preserved.

Heidi Napier  
January 6, 2010, 4:03 am  
3176 El Tejon Rd.  
Cameron Park, California 95682

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Keep your hands and regulations off the internet. We don't want or need your "open internet" rules.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Wallace Napiwocki  
January 6, 2010, 4:34 am  
487 Timberlale Drive  
Lowell, Indiana 46356

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring that network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Nick Narcowich  
January 6, 2010, 5:48 am  
854 Vasona ST.  
Milpitas, California 95035

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank you for your time,

Nick Narcowich

Father Harold Eugene Nash  
January 6, 2010, 6:05 am  
PO. Box 5255  
Quartzsite, Arizona 85359

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This "net neutrality" is a lie. It is nothing less than another Obama Government take over. Please lets call a spade a spade. This is a COMMUNIST take over of our rights. Mr. Obama is scared to death of the people of the UNITED STATES. If he does not control all forms of communication he will never be relected, and he should not be. I and MILLIONS of AMERICANS have fought and many have died for our CONSTITUTION. Will you let this man how has never served in our miletary never put his life on the line, destroy WE THE PEOPLES RIGHTS???

For GOD and Country

+++Bishop Harold E. Nash

Charles Nauman  
January 6, 2010, 6:11 am  
11411 Adventure Hill Lane  
Chesterfield, Virginia 23838

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

kelly nealis  
January 6, 2010, 7:44 am  
510 river road  
beaver, Pennsylvania 15009

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Internet censorship is well known in countries such as North Korea & even China. Bad enough the govt. has taken over private banks & industries, but to try and take over health care & now the internet is extremely alarming.

Our economy has suffered enough, and our children & grandchildren will have enough debts to burden them due to the socialistic/communistic govt. bailouts. To then further hamper future generations economically is not acceptable. This administration has done far too much damage already, and should get out of the private sector altogether -- including the internet. Soon this administration will be trying to regulate the very air that we breathe! Oh, wait ... that's right ... they already are regulating the air that we breathe!

Please, don't do any more damage to future generations.

David Nealy  
January 6, 2010, 7:45 am  
1532 Warpath Dr  
Kingsport, Tennessee 37664

I am submitting my comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

sue nebe  
January 6, 2010, 7:52 am  
32574 Oakwood  
Farmington Hills, Michigan 48334

I don't believe that the government has any place interfering with the internet-- so keep hands off!

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

J DAVID NEDRESKI

January 6, 2010, 8:08 am

4260 LINDEN LN

SUMTER, South Carolina 29154

PLEASE KEEP YOUR HANDS OFF OUR INTERNET!!!!!!!!!!!!!!



Barbara Nelson  
January 6, 2010, 8:09 am  
4469 Hornet Drive  
Prescott, Arizona 86301

As an Americans for Prosperity reader, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is already open - and highly competitive. If government exercises control over the Internet, it will no longer be open - and there is no alternative better for fast, free communication.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Edward Nelson  
January 6, 2010, 8:15 am  
705 Ave Due Fontaiane Bleau  
MAry Esther, Florida 32569

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Lastly, the last thing this country needs is more control over its citizens lives. Last time I checked, this was the USA, not Venezuela. If I wanted the government to run everything, I'd go move in with Chavez.

john Nelson  
January 6, 2010, 8:30 am  
4196 Smoke Signal  
Sebring, Florida 33872

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Countries like Iran and China control Internets, they can shut them down when they want. This is not freedom as we know it here in the United States. We need to keep the internet open, it is becoming a major business in the United States, and we do not want the governments getting thier hands on it and totally ruining it as they have most every other program that they have taken control of.

This is not a Socialist country, and we the American people want to keep it that way. Get Government our o the net.

Teresa Nelson  
January 6, 2010, 8:41 am  
296 Demboski Road  
Iron River, Michigan 49935

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,

Teresa Nelson

Catherine Nelson-Dittmann  
January 6, 2010, 8:41 am  
2186 Grant Court  
Windom, Minnesota 56101

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

It is time for this administration to take its grimy hands out of our private lives.

Rebecca Nesbitt  
January 6, 2010, 9:10 am  
6341 Creekcrest Circle  
Citrus Heights, California 95621

A transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

James Nesler  
January 6, 2010, 9:40 am  
7812 N. Henry Ruff Rd.  
Westland, Michigan 48185

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Please hear my voice, Thank you.

Keith NeSmith  
January 6, 2010, 9:43 am  
840 Moccasin Creek Rd.  
Clarksville, Georgia 30523

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

It's called freedom of speech. What part of "Congress shall make no law" do you not understand. Amendment 1 to the U.S. Constitution. You swore an oath to defend and protect the constitution.



Joan Neuman  
January 6, 2010, 9:45 am  
562 Rocky Mountain Dr. North  
Effort, Pennsylvania 18330

This is America NOT Cuba, Iran!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Toni Neumann  
January 6, 2010, 10:04 am  
21735 Park Bend  
Katy, Texas 77450

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. It will stifle innovation. As we have seen in the public utility arena.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Damon Neutzling  
January 6, 2010, 10:04 am  
6667 Athol Ave  
Elkridge, Maryland 21075

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Marylou Nicharot  
January 6, 2010, 10:17 am  
10610 Inverness Dr  
10610 Inverness Dr  
Jacksonville, Florida 32257

Let's see, a few years back a federal court case opened up communications via phone service and ever since we have had exorbitant phone bills, extremely high cost telephone sets, etc. How about you keep your hands off any and all forms of communication unless a federal law is broken. Read the constitution and abide by our laws. As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Debbie Nicholas  
January 6, 2010, 10:23 am  
15040 CR 285  
Tyler, Texas 75707

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dave & Pat Nicolas  
January 6, 2010, 10:35 am  
7602 Peacock Drive  
Huntsville, Alabama 35802

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, We are submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

We are especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Linda Nieder  
January 6, 2010, 10:43 am  
4240 valley view rd  
edina, Minnesota 55424

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The internet is a free zone and we don't need this govt. taking over what little we have left. Stay away from our open forums and places where our voices can still be heard. My God! This country is becoming what the Soviet Union used to be!

Alan Nitikman  
January 6, 2010, 10:44 am  
c/o Extended Stay Deluxe  
19311 NW Cornell Rd, #307  
Hillsboro, Oregon 97124-9010

As an individual American citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding "the matter of preserving the open Internet." GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive and highly available. There are many providers and all those whose services I have used have maintained a hands-off policy in regard to communications. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, it would be in violation of free speech, a violation of the First Amendment.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will block legitimate business models, suppress free expression, and create gross inefficiencies that do not now exist. It would create uncertainty and risk of litigation. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would be hobbled to the point at which many would be deprived access to something which is currently working just fine, which is private, and over which the government has no right to exert control. The attempt of the writers of this act intend government control, under government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I strongly oppose this unnecessary action and will make my voice heard in opposition. Leave the internet alone.

Thank you.



gary noah  
January 6, 2010, 10:45 am  
po box 1013  
cedaredge, Colorado 81413

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

PS: stay the hell out of our lives!!!

Abigail Nobel  
January 6, 2010, 10:49 am  
2794 1/2 142nd Ave  
Dorr, Michigan 49323

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am strongly opposed to increased governmental regulation of the internet. The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James L Noble  
January 6, 2010, 10:50 am  
14890 Big Basin Way  
Boulder Creek, California 95006

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James Noennig  
January 6, 2010, 10:56 am  
Box 825  
Vail, Arizona 85641

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive with a huge number of private companies, including telephone and cable companies, fighting for their niche. I live in Mexico most of the year and depend on the internet for almost everything. In my opinion it is functioning perfectly well and policing itself.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government, if anywhere. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Michael Nordloh  
January 6, 2010, 11:02 am  
5169 Romohr Rd.  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45244

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mi

Cynthia Norman  
January 6, 2010, 11:04 am  
414 Hollen Road  
Baltimore, Maryland 21212

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Keep your cotton picking, grubby little hands off the internet. We do not need more government control over aspects of our lives, we need less. The free market system is able to remedy its ills without government intervention.

Donna Norman  
January 6, 2010, 11:09 am  
13570 Forest Lake Dr.  
Largo, Florida 33771

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

What has happened to our first Amendment rights? Freedom of speech? Why is it fine to hear and read all the evil one can say against Conservatives, Christians, heterosexuals, but we are to praise and love and respect the opposite? The TV is pure liberalism and Conservatives have only a handful of channels to watch? If you think there is anyone on the Internet that is unbiased, it's a lie. There isn't a person ALIVE that doesn't have biases. We all are entitled to our own biases and WOW we have the CHOICE to read OR NOT READ something on the Internet. NO! Abide by the First Amendment of the US CONSTITUTION and give us FREE SPEECH..... It is tiresome how many people forget about the laws of this land. It is time to stop doing it!!

William Norman  
January 6, 2010, 11:10 am  
34 N. York Gate Ct.  
The Woodlands, Texas 77382

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I would NOT want to happen in the USA what has happened in IRAN, VENEZUELA, and CHINA. The type of tyranny that these governments have exercised could easily be purport rated on the citizenry IF these rules are enacted.



Barry Northcutt  
January 6, 2010, 11:10 am  
3303 Fallston Waco Rd  
Cherryville, North Carolina 28021

As an Americans for Prosperity supporter, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Marian Norwood  
January 6, 2010, 11:13 am  
1201 Terry Dr.  
Bellevue, Nebraska 68123

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mindi Novasio  
January 6, 2010, 11:24 am  
8403 Kings Cove Dr  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84121

STOP!!! I am so sick of having the government in every aspect of my life! Government is an endless pit of my money, spent foolishly. Stay out of one of the few things we have left... the internet!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Patricia Noyes  
January 6, 2010, 11:26 am  
9971 N. Colony Drive  
Oro Valley, Arizona 85737

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Renato Nunes  
January 6, 2010, 11:28 am  
8021 Resin Road  
Murrells Inlet, South Carolina 29576

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive and the last bastion of freedom in America. It is a last frontier where real freedom exists!

THE LAST THING I WANT IS MORE GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE UNDER THE EXCUSE OF ENSURING FAIRNESS AND DISCIPLINE.

I KNOW THAT IT WILL END UP IN CENSORSHIP OF FREE SPEECH.  
VERY NEO-MARXIST BUT ANTI-AMERICAN.  
SEND YOUR "TSARS" TO THE SOVIET UNION WHERE THEY BELONG AND KEEP AMERICA FREE.

Sincerely,  
Renato Nunes

Theda Nunn  
January 6, 2010, 11:32 am  
3030 N 14th Street Apt 201  
Phoenix, Arizona 85014

As an American, I wish to comment on the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am totally against the government doing anything to limit a free press beyond clamping down on obscenity (which includes graphic violence as well as sexual improprieties). I do not understand why our government has not yet recognized internet bloggers as "the press". Just as our television signals are now routed through cables and satellites, so too our news is conveyed by the internet. I believe that internet bloggers are exercising our constitutional rights of free speech. Let's keep it free and let's keep it clean!

William Nunnery  
January 6, 2010, 11:37 am  
100 Shadow Bend Lane  
Cary, North Carolina 27518

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

To adopt "net neutrality" would be a giant step backwards reminiscent of the days when phone service was regulated (Ma Bell), costs were extremely high, service was abominable, alternatives did not exist, and technological progress was virtually non-existent.

Vicki Nuzum  
January 6, 2010, 11:41 am  
112 South 201 Street  
Elkhorn, Nebraska 68022

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

PLEASE DO NOT BE DEAF. WE ELECTED YOU IN HOPES FOR FREEDOM NOT MORE LAWS, REGULATIONS & TAXES. PLEASE LISTEN NOW.



Jim Obenschain  
January 6, 2010, 11:50 am  
2542 Greyling Drive  
San Diego, California 92123

Gentlemen it is imperative that the FCC stay away from the internet. As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dennis Oboyle  
January 6, 2010, 12:02 pm  
1411 West Edgerton Avenue  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53221

As a free person and one of We, The People of The United States of America, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Frank OBrien  
January 6, 2010, 12:04 pm  
485 Arricola  
St Augustine, Florida 32080

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

It is important to me that you begin to understand that the American people want less government intervention in their lives not more.

Joe O'Dea  
January 6, 2010, 12:10 pm  
1804 Crofton Parkway  
Crofton, Maryland 21114

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. I oppose any further government regulations that will infringe on the freedom of the commerce and communications of the Internet.

Leland Ogren  
January 6, 2010, 12:53 pm  
2505 Sea Robin Rd  
Pensacola, Florida 32526

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

To quote an age old axiom, "If it isn't broken, don't try to fix it". To the vast majority of us it certainly isn't broken.

Seana O'Hare  
January 6, 2010, 12:56 pm  
4905 Bangor Drive  
Kensington, Maryland 20895-1213

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

SUCH A TRANSFORMATION OF THE INTERNET INTO A GOVERNMENT-CONTROLLED PUBLIC UTILITY IS UNACCEPTABLE. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

ENOUGH BIG GOVERNMENT! AND ENOUGH GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF PRIVATE INDUSTRIES.

Dennis O'Leary  
January 6, 2010, 12:57 pm  
2427 Biron St  
Mandeville, Louisiana 70448

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The government has a motto.  
If it's not broke, fix it until it is.

Leave the Internet alone, it's working fine, just the way it is.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

The free market should decide, not the government.

john olesen  
January 6, 2010, 1:00 pm  
11321 edgemere rd  
n/a  
roscoe, Illinois 61073

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



guy olsen  
January 6, 2010, 1:01 pm  
25 lilley st.  
manchester, Connecticut 6040

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that will be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. Prioritization will ultimately stifle business.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Janet Olson  
January 6, 2010, 1:14 pm  
9079 Doemel Ln.  
Pickerel, Wisconsin 54465

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Linda ONeall  
January 6, 2010, 1:29 pm  
11717 Flying W  
Amarillo, Texas 79118

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We do not want more government regulation! This is becoming a nightmare of a government trying to control every aspect of our lives as if we are not intelligent enough to control our own. It is hard to believe this is America if we are having to fight at every turn to maintain common freedoms!

Get out of our lives!

Roger Opiela  
January 6, 2010, 1:35 pm  
4437 Hwy 57  
Sturgeon Bay, Wisconsin 54235

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Marvin Orr  
January 6, 2010, 1:38 pm  
P.O. Box 63  
165 North 725 West  
Moreland, Idaho 83256-0063

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

As a concerned taxpayer and user of the internet I agree with the forgoing prepared comments. Any government venture into so called regulation of the internet would actually be a move for power and control of this vehicle of free speech and expression. Any regulation and/or control of the internet should be looked upon as unconstitutional.

charles osborne  
January 6, 2010, 1:51 pm  
5733 N. Flora Ave.  
Fresno, California 93710

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Michael O'Shaughnessy  
January 6, 2010, 1:51 pm  
91 Valley Dr  
Salem, Connecticut 6420

Hands off the Internet! It has flourished without government intervention. It will suffer and be stifled by the government's interference and attempt to control it.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Susan Osterhout  
January 6, 2010, 1:52 pm  
1933 Ladybug Lane  
DeLand, Florida 32720

Hands off the internet please. As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Nicholas Ostrosky  
January 6, 2010, 2:15 pm  
1428 Lincoln Ct.  
Union, Kentucky 41091

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jerome Otto  
January 6, 2010, 2:34 pm  
15600 NE 8th St, Ste B1 #991  
Bellevue, Washington 98008

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Especially at a time when we need Capitalism to create new jobs and put Americans to work!

Candace Owens  
January 6, 2010, 2:38 pm  
910 Lystra Lane  
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27517

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

William Owens  
January 6, 2010, 2:48 pm  
5 West Hill Place  
Boston, Massachusetts 2114

Simply this: Please stop trying to regulate the everyday life of every citizen of the United States of America. The internet works pretty well now. Government bureaucrats will foul it up so that it no longer functions efficiently.

Please apply the common sense principle "If it works, don't fix it"!

Thank you.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Vicky Ozment  
January 6, 2010, 3:04 pm  
3434 Jacona Ct.  
Jacksonville, Florida 322577

As a concerned American citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ann Palladino  
January 6, 2010, 3:31 pm  
631 Wagner Road  
Lafayette Hill, Pennsylvania 19444

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

To sum up: LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE!

ANDREA PALMER  
January 6, 2010, 3:33 pm  
176 WEST PROSPECT AVE APT 9  
PITTSBURGH, Pennsylvania 15205

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Andrew Palmer  
January 6, 2010, 3:45 pm  
9852 N., Lewis Ave.  
Kansas City, Missouri 64157

I KNOW THE BELOW MESSAGE IS A FORM LETTER CREATED BY AFP. I AGREE WITH EVERY SINGLE WORD OF IT. KEEP YOUR DAMNED HANDS OFF OF THE INTERNET, IT DOES NOT NEED REGULATED. THE GOVERNMENT SCREWS UP EVERYTHING THING THAT IT TOUCHES. YOU DONT NEED TO PUT YOUR HEAVY HANDS ON THIS ONE.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Leanna Palmer  
January 6, 2010, 3:58 pm  
2563 Black Pine Dr  
Castle Rock, Colorado 80104

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

We must protect our right to our Freedom of Speech!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Kerry Palmiter  
January 6, 2010, 4:01 pm  
530 belmont dr  
530 belmont dr  
romeoville, Illinois 60446

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

We do not want government control of the internet, the press, the phone company, our medical system or anything else! Government needs to have less of a roll and start listening to the people!!!

jane Panopoulos  
January 6, 2010, 4:11 pm  
7311 Lindley Ave.  
Reseda, California 91335

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Furthermore, the government has no concept of how systems out of their field of expertise work. Please do not touch our private parts... it's rude... and you are not a doctor.

Remy Papp  
January 6, 2010, 4:37 pm  
15 Norman Lane  
Huntington, Connecticut 6484

I am totally opposed to any government interference or take-over effort by any political party or individual having any political agenda. In that spirit I fully underline and agree with the sentiments expressed in the following written comments and urge - no, demand - careful reading and compliance with them.  
RPPapp

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Cat Paradiso  
January 6, 2010, 4:40 pm  
595 S Angus  
Pueblo, Colorado 81007

PLEASE STOP KILLING JOBS....I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Janice Parker  
January 6, 2010, 5:24 pm  
508 Glover St  
Hendersonville, North Carolina 28792

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am against the government exercising control over the internet. I believe we should let the market forces control it.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Judy Parker  
January 6, 2010, 5:31 pm  
19117 E 30th Ter  
Independence, Missouri 64057

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I would think that the government has enough to worry about without trying to take over EVERY PART of OUR LIVES. Read the constitution. Find out what your responsibilities are then stick to those. You'll find your life much more rewarding.

Marlene Parker  
January 6, 2010, 5:34 pm  
1901 N Thompson St  
Conroe, Texas 77301-1241

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Government: STAY OUT OF MY BUSINESS. STOP TRYING TO GOVERN EVERY ASPECT OF OUR LIVES. ABIDE BY THE U.S. CONSTITUTION!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Ray Parker  
January 6, 2010, 5:40 pm  
9881 e Pinto Pony dr  
Florence, Arizona 85132

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Government shall refrain from encroaching on American's freedoms or these infractions will be repealed as the majority of Americans are fed up with political takeovers!

Matthew Parmer  
January 6, 2010, 5:41 pm  
292 River Place Dr NW  
Calhoun, Georgia 30701

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The fact that this change is even being considered is highly troublesome, and should be voted on by Americans in an open vote, not by a committee in a closed room.

Jason Parnell  
January 6, 2010, 5:50 pm  
2151 Cumberland PKWY SE  
Apt 107  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339

As an American concerned for the greater good, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sue Parnell  
January 6, 2010, 6:00 pm  
121 Perch  
Estes, Texas 78382

I submit the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Warren Parr  
January 6, 2010, 6:20 pm  
117 E.bobwhite ln  
23  
Harker Hgts, Texas 76548

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I paid For my computer not the dam government . And I should not pay or loss my choices to appease a butch of dam NIGGERS. THE USA pampers the DAM NIGGERS TO MUCH AS IT IS and it is the NIGGER in the White HOuse whom is destroying the USA..  
BANSD ALL NIGGERS from using the WEB as you give a nigger a mile and he want the whole country.

Warren Parr  
January 6, 2010, 6:21 pm  
117 E.bobwhite ln  
23  
Harker Hgts, Texas 76548

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I paid For my computer not the dam government . And I should not pay or loss my choices to appease a butch of dam NIGGERS. THE USA pampers the DAM NIGGERS TO MUCH AS IT IS and it is the NIGGER in the White HOuse whom is destroying the USA..  
BANSD ALL NIGGERS from using the WEB as you give a nigger a mile and he want the whole country.

Lisa Partlow  
January 6, 2010, 6:38 pm  
92 Vosburgh Road  
Mechanicville, New York 12118

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I want to protect my rights to FREEDOM OF SPEECH!!!!

Lisa K Partlow

glen pate  
January 6, 2010, 7:10 pm  
181 Cardinal Lane  
mena, Arkansas 71953

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52: Is there ANYTHING our government doesn't want to take over??

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Joseph Paterick  
January 6, 2010, 7:17 pm  
2552 South Superior Street  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53207

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Donald Paul  
January 6, 2010, 7:37 pm  
112 Highland Circle  
Halifax, Pennsylvania 17032

As an American Citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Robin Paul  
January 6, 2010, 7:50 pm  
685 N Route 47  
Cape May Court House, New Jersey 8210

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

\*\*\*STOP GOVERNMENT GRASPING AND OVERREACHING\*\*\*HANDS OFF

Wes & Tanna Paulson  
January 6, 2010, 8:15 pm  
121 Compound Lp  
Lolo, Montana 59847

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Timothy Pearson  
January 6, 2010, 8:19 pm  
2556 Anderson Dr.  
Belvidere, Illinois 61008

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Russ Pelham  
January 6, 2010, 8:23 pm  
48 Merry Ave  
Duxbury, Missouri 2332

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Let free market forcces reign!!

Traci Pellegrino  
January 6, 2010, 8:51 pm  
13905 Spirit Trail Place NE  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87112

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

B. Lee Pemberton  
January 6, 2010, 8:51 pm  
P.O. Box 151  
New Creek, West Virginia 26743

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Not under any circumstances should the FCC regulate any part of the Internet that it is not authorized to regulate at this moment. Government interference has no benefit.



Karen Pennebaker  
January 6, 2010, 8:57 pm  
228 Ivy Run Rd  
Troy, West Virginia 26443

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

There is no reason for the federal government to regulate anything on the internet. The free exchange of ideas and information should be considered a natural right. Also, the internet is in use world wide and NO government has the right to control it.

If there is content online that people disapprove of, they have the right to ignore it, to petition the person or organization who posted it, or if it is libelous, to sue the individual involved. There is no need for any new legislation involving the internet, its use or content

Al and Ruth Penner  
January 6, 2010, 9:11 pm  
P.O.Box 332  
124 W.Miami  
Edna, Kansas 67342

nd let the freedoms that so many have died for just be pushed away.

Simon Percival  
January 6, 2010, 9:37 pm  
10317 Watch Tower Court  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27614

Regarding the matter of "preserving the open Internet" GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dana Peters  
January 6, 2010, 9:58 pm  
921 Lester Road  
Chatham, Virginia 24531

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dana Peters

Davpd Peters  
January 6, 2010, 10:18 pm  
543 wsherwood ct  
Muskogee, Oklahoma 74403

+As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “c

Carl Peterson  
January 6, 2010, 10:48 pm  
38254 Row River Road  
Dorena, Oregon 97434

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

REGULATION OF THE INTERNET IS NOT A FUNCTION OF GOVERNMENT.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Donald Peterson  
January 6, 2010, 11:21 pm  
1835 E. Main St  
El Cajon, California 92021

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I would like to see the Internet stay "free". The government doesn't need to get involved in everything that is successful, and mess it up with unnecessary regulation and control.

Helen Peterson  
January 6, 2010, 11:49 pm  
7070 N Farm Road 191  
Fair Grove, Missouri 65648

Please leave what few, free things we have alone!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Sandra Peterson  
January 7, 2010, 12:39 am  
607 E. 2nd Ave, #2  
607 E. 2nd Ave, #2  
Ellensburg, Washington 98926

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

You all think that you are so clever and can pull the wool over everyone's eyes. What you all want is government takeover and control of the internet; just another step towards a "New World Order" or one world government. I am completely against government takeover of the internet or of anything else.

When are you people at the White House going to start serving the "People" (your fellow Americans). Wake up and smell the "dung" you all are creating for our children and grandchildren, etc. Wake up and see the future "chains" you are placing on all of us and our families...including yourselves I might add. Think of all of our fore bearers and what they fought for and how many died to preserve our freedoms. Now, you and others are willing to ignore past history for green paper that will only bring you temporary happiness and security. Oh, to those with no true purpose of heart. Oh, to those with no kind heart. Oh, to those that are only out to look after their own evil tailbone. Greediness is wickedness, and wickedness was never happiness.

I can't say that I am an activist as this Americans for Prosperity" website would like me to be. I am merely a Patriotic, and a "Proud to be an American", citizen of the United States that has some hind site and is seeing this country going down the toilet. A very sad site to see. I am positive that all of those that fought for our freedoms past are turning in their graves.

I am very disappointed in most every single person employed by or has any connection with the plights of those at the White House. I used to have some respect for those that hold office. But respect is something that is earned not instilled by fear or by demand...or by turning our nation into a socialist society.

Shame on all of you and may God send you what you deserve...although in a more kind light I should say...may God have mercy on your souls. Repent ye, repent ye.

What's next...trying to take over our freedom of speech?

Sincerely,  
Concerned Citizen

Sharon Peteson  
January 7, 2010, 12:44 am  
2917 Oaktop Circle  
Greensboro, North Carolina 27410

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

To the Point: The government does not need to infringe in any on the internet!

Catherine Petroski  
January 7, 2010, 1:22 am  
3910 Plymouth Road  
Durham, North Carolina 27707

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Charles Petty  
January 7, 2010, 5:54 am  
114 San Saba Dr  
Portland, Texas 78374

As an Americans I have this comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Leave the Internet as it presently is. No government restrictions and not government subsidies.

Let the free market produce the results that competition brings. Many years of government involvement in our way of life have tragically proven most government run programs and organizations are failures, even if they continue to operate simply because the taxpayer has to prop them up.

Barbara Pezzuto  
January 7, 2010, 7:20 am  
518 Monmouth Ave  
Linden, New Jersey 7036

As an Americans , I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

mary phannenstill  
January 7, 2010, 7:28 am  
8009 County Line Rd.  
Racine, Wisconsin 53402

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Keep government hands off the Internet. We are a free society. We are a representative democracy. NO to government interference, regulation, intrusion in the Internet!!!

Bob Philbeck  
January 7, 2010, 8:08 am  
2712 Cambridge Road  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27608

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jim & Luana Phillips  
January 7, 2010, 8:13 am  
6169 Tabor Church Road  
Fayetteville, North Carolina 28312-7267

As a consumer and voter in America, I have seen what well meaning Gov. officials have done in trying to regulate communications. In an effort to be helpful the free and easy communication becomes a tangled mess of rules and regulations that stops innovation and communication.

Please allow the internet to be free and self regulating. Bad places and bad people will be found out and black-listed and good ones promoted. For some people in the world, the internet is the only "free" place they have to tell their story and read about freedom.

We agree with the following message written by people smarter than us and we are willing to discuss or defend our position with anyone. Thanks,JLP

---

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Judy Phillips  
January 7, 2010, 8:15 am  
444 County Road 569  
Kirbyville, Texas 75956

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, the Internet would be in a mess!!! Government has NEVER been able to run or control anything correctly!!!

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Tara Phillips  
January 7, 2010, 8:16 am  
318 Euclid Ave  
Lynchburg, Virginia 24501

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank You  
Tara M. Phillips

Tracey Phillips  
January 7, 2010, 8:27 am  
405 East Bay Ave  
Kingsland, Georgia 31548

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Richard Picard  
January 7, 2010, 8:52 am  
11 Hollyberry Lane  
Hilton Head Island, South Carolina 29928

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Richard Picard

Chat Picken  
January 7, 2010, 10:01 am  
6300 Rea Rd  
Dundee, Michigan 48131

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Please do not allow any government intervention in the internet in any way.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please do not allow any government intervention in the internet in any way.

KittyJo Pierce  
January 7, 2010, 10:30 am  
126 S Highland Ave  
Bucyrus, Ohio 44820

If it's not broke, don't attempt to fix it!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Virginia A Pierce-Mejia  
January 7, 2010, 10:50 am  
12259 Laurel Glade Court  
Apt. 202  
Reston, Virginia 20191

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is not a government agency: It is public property. Leave it alone! If it becomes private, the company could block or censor Internet traffic maliciously: It is being done now. Every 5th or 6th site I choose is blocked already and is unlawful; hence error #404. Government control over the Internet is in our way and is against my rights as a citizen: To assembly, free speech, and often, contact with my state senators and representatives.

The Government using [Net Neutrality & Open Network] will get in our way and we will be adrift with no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress: American citizens do not want a regulatory Commission in place to restrict Internet content [paragraph 77 of the NPRM (the Commission may decide interest should be prioritized)].

In the absence of *\*concrete\** necessity, the Internet should be as it presently is; for the people -- not the government. You are not needed and you are not wanted.

Leave Americans in peace with the Internet that we prefer. Thank you.

pijmfrqo pijmfrqo

January 7, 2010, 10:58 am

yvjoxi@lnpdoe.com

yvjoxi@lnpdoe.com

FsDGPvfYMFHk, Alaska NKXyRHFPTbi

4zjuoP <a href="http://dwimcwrphxjp.com/">dwimcwrphxjp</a>, [url=http://xzppbkbosey.com/]xzppbkbosey[/url],  
[link=http://vmztjhgyrel.com/]vmztjhgyrel[/link], http://hpivjodwutnf.com/



Henry Pillow  
January 7, 2010, 10:59 am  
118 Jackson street  
Edenton, North Carolina 27932

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ernest Pino  
January 7, 2010, 11:14 am  
8149 Bayberry Court  
Manassas, Virginia 20110

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The Internet “as is” works well - worldwide - and ANY interference by the US Government will (and should) bring loud complaints from other countries that would be affected by such US government actions. Leave it be!

John Pinto  
January 7, 2010, 12:04 pm  
609 N. Westfield Rd.  
Madison, Wisconsin 53717

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

Please leave us alone and get the government out of our lives. We do not need any more regulation of the internet, especially in the way you are proposing. Please leave us alone to make our own decisions.

Brenda Pirrera  
January 7, 2010, 12:13 pm  
4332 Creek Dr.  
Springfield, Illinois 62711

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Once again, there is no good reason for the government to intervene or try to take over this aspect of our lives also. Too much already!!

Anthony Piscatella, Jr.  
January 7, 2010, 12:17 pm  
203 Hunt Club Drive  
Summerville, South Carolina 29485

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In addition to the above comments, I view any action by the federal government to control or regulate the internet as an infringement on my First Amendment rights under the Constitution of the United States.

Andrew Plaice  
January 7, 2010, 12:17 pm  
1624 S Marblehead Road  
Lewisville, North Carolina 27023

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Henry Platt  
January 7, 2010, 12:18 pm  
524 Hwy 234,  
Lockesburg, Arkansas 71846

We see this effort by the Obama administration to control the internet as an unwarranted effort by the radical left to exercise further control over the agency of the citizens of the United States. Please make every effort to protect the freedom of the internet!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Becky Plowman  
January 7, 2010, 1:02 pm  
3225 N Cedar St  
Lansing, Michigan 48906

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I want less government control, less government spending, and will fight to keep the rights that have been granted to me by our Constitution and our Bill of Rights. It is time for the federal government to step back, stop the excess spending, and stop the intrusion on the American people as a whole in our everyday lives. You are supposed to be our representatives; NOT OUR RULERS. This is just one more way of taking over total control and it is unwanted and unjustified.



Pat Plowman  
January 7, 2010, 1:15 pm  
PO Box 173  
Boyd, Montana 59013

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

PLEASE DO NOT PROCEED WITH THE PROPOSED "OPEN INTERNET" RULES WHICH WOULD, IN FACT, DESTROY IT BY DESTROYING PRIVATE INVESTMENT.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

E Plye  
January 7, 2010, 1:16 pm  
444 East St  
Hinsdale, IL, Indiana 60521

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Susan Podiak  
January 7, 2010, 1:35 pm  
761 River Rd  
Chatham, New Jersey 7928

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Susan Podiak

Harry Poland  
January 7, 2010, 1:51 pm  
190 Steeplechase Ln.  
Mocksville, North Carolina 27028

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

ANOTHER POLITICAL GRAB! This time it is free speech.

JERRY POLLARD  
January 7, 2010, 2:01 pm  
7260 E VALCO DR  
AMMON, Idaho 83401

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

SUMMARY: The internet is our first amendment right..Period

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thomas Pope  
January 7, 2010, 2:22 pm  
28084 Weddel Ave  
Brownstown, Michigan 48183

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

As usual the radicals on the left take the free internet as a thing yo change, just like North Korea, Venezuela, Iran, and a number of other so-called "PROGRESSIVE" countries.  
Leave the internet the way it is. If the left is happy, debate it in open foremat, not behind closed locked doors!!!!!!

THOMAS JAMES POPE SR

Pamela Poppa  
January 7, 2010, 2:57 pm  
31878 Del Obispo ste 118 #338  
San Juan Capistrano, California 92675

As an American citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Earle Porche  
January 7, 2010, 2:57 pm  
5112 Haring Court  
Metairie, Louisiana 70006

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Leave the Internet alone!!! No more BIG government control!!



Clifford Potter  
January 7, 2010, 3:15 pm  
2054 Wildcat Road  
Sparta, Tennessee 38583

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

p.s. AMAN Clifford Potter Thank-you

Sarah Potter  
January 7, 2010, 3:30 pm  
2480 Wilson St.  
Hillsdale, Michigan 49242

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jim Potts  
January 7, 2010, 3:33 pm  
2405 Society Place  
Newtown, Pennsylvania 18940

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ben Powell  
January 7, 2010, 3:34 pm  
PO Box 91  
Bellaire, Michigan 49615

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I stand absolutely opposed to all schemes, both commercial and governmental, to interfere with the free exchange of fact and opinion.

The First Amendment applies as well to the internet as it does to other forms of communication.

As both a creator and consumer of blog content, I want to see the bytes keep flowing smoothly, without gatekeepers censoring content delivery.

Jennifer Pozun  
January 7, 2010, 3:36 pm  
33109 SE Kent Kangley Rd  
Ravensdale, Washington 98051

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Stop trying to regulate every aspect of our lives. Private business, aka capitalism, is the way of America and a big part of our success as a nation. Look at the US post office, which is run by none other than our government, which wouldn't even exist if it weren't for our paychecks supporting you. The P.O. is billions in debt, go figure. Who's running it, oh yea, the US government. Easily 1/2 our measly paycheck goes to federal taxes, sales taxes, property taxes, etal.

So much of what this government does is a huge waste! Quit trying to control the media with your 'net nuetrality' and don't waste our money on Your version of what the internet ought to be. It is not a monopoly, it is competitive and should remain that way. When a business gives great customer service it usually succeeds.

When a talk show host or games show host or auto show or physical wellnes host are successful, it's because they have talent and engage the audience, they've earned their right to be heard.

Neutrality doesn't exist in the real world. Some work til their skin and bones and can barely put food on the table and keep up with the mortgage, others sit on their .....chairs all day drinking coffee and talking it up with co workers and dine in fancy restaurants making more money than they know how to wisely spend. Life is not fair, it never will be. Quit trying to fix things.

Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney. Keep your hands off this one. Why do you feel the need to control every aspect of our lives? The citizens of America, who pay your extravagant wages, are going broke because of your constant waste of our money and your poor use of time.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. When you try to fix what isn't broke you end up with unnecessary expense, wasted time and energy, and frustration to all of us.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

George Pratt  
January 7, 2010, 3:51 pm  
PO Box 447  
Hernando, Florida 34442

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. I do believe this resonates as curtailing freedom of speech. Let's take it to court.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney, both Socialists.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Brent price  
January 7, 2010, 3:55 pm  
1211 bonfoy ave  
colo. springs, Colorado 80909

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

As a small business I depend on the internet to bring customers to my site. We can't afford gov't to ruin a profitable business model and then use more tax payer \$ to subsidize it the same way you are doing with our health care. Why is the European model better with their slow growth rate and huge bureaucracy?

George Price  
January 7, 2010, 4:17 pm  
102 Lannys Lane  
Mountain Home, Arkansas 72653

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This is the last medium that the public can freely expree their opinion. Any restrictions on this medium would be as bad as the restrictios Hithler imposed on Germany in his rise to power.



Ralph Prickett  
January 7, 2010, 4:41 pm  
236 Holly Drive  
Spartanburg, South Carolina 29301

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Hands off the Internet!

We dont need censorship, which is all this is about!

Hands off the AM Broadcast band too!

Respectfully,

Ralph Prickett

Carol Printz, M.S.W.  
January 7, 2010, 5:01 pm  
19355 Cypress Ridge Terr, #709  
Leesburg, Virginia 20176

## HANDS OFF OUR INTERNET, COMMIES!!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Judy Proctor  
January 7, 2010, 5:29 pm  
7604 S. Fallen Rock Road  
Brazil, Indiana 47834

In RE: GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am deeply opposed to government control of the internet. This is not China. I believe the purpose of government control is to gain more power over the information available to the people, as they do in China. It totally destroys the whole concept of freedom of speech and freedom of information.

This is totally against the US Constitution. If you do this, I will support a lawsuit to stop you.

James Przyborowski  
January 7, 2010, 5:44 pm  
59 Marshall Road  
Hillsborough, New Jersey 8844

As an Americans for Prosperity supporter, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We don't need net "neutrality"... we need net "FREEDOM". We are against government interference of ANY sort as it will only serve to impinge upon the First Amendment rights of Americans.

Shirley A Przywara  
January 7, 2010, 5:45 pm  
243 Hoffman Avenue, Apt 301  
Windber, Pennsylvania 15963

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Finally, the government has interfered with schools, social security, health concerns, etc. When is someone going to wake up and get rid of the culprits trying to pass this nonsense and stay out of the citizens' business -- ship immigrants back to their own countries -- why should they get social security when they have paid nothing into it? Wake up AMERICA -- MY COUNTRY!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

psuiwfg psuiwfg

January 7, 2010, 5:50 pm

gjdne@amlcyp.com

gjdne@amlcyp.com

buFVlznOrlUtd, Oklahoma DCCTqE <a href="http://atrdeftoamcl.com/">atrdeftoamcl</a>,  
[url=http://ndjtukwwzrqm.com/]ndjtukwwzrqm[/url], [link=http://qect

DCCTqE <a href="http://atrdeftoamcl.com/">atrdeftoamcl</a>, [url=http://ndjtukwwzrqm.com/]ndjtukwwzrqm[/url],  
[link=http://qectgevdwjll.com/]qectgevdwjll[/link], http://glsmsaccjgdc.com/

Tony Puentes  
January 7, 2010, 5:54 pm  
320 SW 22nd St  
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33315

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Leave the internet alone.

Jo Puntil-Sheltman  
January 7, 2010, 6:03 pm  
P.O. Box 461256  
Leeds, Utah 84746

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Lois Purrington  
January 7, 2010, 6:17 pm  
46 Mountain Street  
Whitehall, New York 12887

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

No more FEDS KEEP YOUR HAND OFF MY INTERNET

Wallace Putnam  
January 7, 2010, 6:35 pm  
4106A Arnold St. NE  
Keizer, Oregon 97303

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In addition, I firmly believe that the FCC is attempting to exercise powers and control that are not granted to it by either the Congress or by any extension of the Constitution, and that any attempt to control the Internet via the so-called "net neutrality" are a direct contravention of the First Amendment. In addition, I firmly believe that, because of actions like this, it is high time to challenge the Constitutionality of the very existence FCC, and/or put very, very strict limitations on it's authority or ability to restrict or control the open exchange of ideas and information over the Internet. Such Government interference is directly opposed to both the General Commerce clause, as well as the entire concept of "General Welfare", and must be opposed in court, if necessary.

armando quincoses  
January 7, 2010, 7:23 pm  
3901 crest rd  
weatherford, Texas 76087

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Your regime is laying out the ground work identical to the totalitarian murderous regime in Cuba. Just ask Yoani Sanchez about it.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

diana rachal  
January 7, 2010, 7:33 pm  
260 palo verde dr  
henderson, Nevada 89015

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Stop destroying the freedoms of the USA.

Theodore Radamaker  
January 7, 2010, 7:44 pm  
3837 Shelter Grove Drive  
Claremont, California 91711

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mary Rafter  
January 7, 2010, 7:45 pm  
12230 NW 71st Street  
Parkland, Florida 33076

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

A transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

pat rains  
January 7, 2010, 7:55 pm  
538 n e 18th ave  
trenton, Missouri 64683

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

The American people will never stand by and allow The US Government control the internet. We've seen the mess they have made of everything else they've taken control of - chaos, debt and runaway taxes. They simply have no business in our private lives. Hands off you Washington mafia made worse by the Chicago mafia!. Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

pat rains  
January 7, 2010, 8:07 pm  
538 N, E. 18th ave  
trenton, Missouri 64683

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I think it's highly unlikely the Government will have any control over the internet, as every person who uses internet will fight this and it will fail.



Jamie Rake  
January 7, 2010, 8:16 pm  
P.O. Box 29  
Waupun, Wisconsin 53963

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I submit the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I'm especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Patricia Ramsey  
January 7, 2010, 8:24 pm  
407 West Monroe  
Auburn, IL, Illinois 62615

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I would like for the government to stay completely out of our lives. There is not one thing they are in control of that they do correctly.

Adam Randlett  
January 7, 2010, 8:41 pm  
22595 Uintah Rd  
22595 Uintah Rd  
Cedaredge, Colorado 81413

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Peggy Rankin  
January 7, 2010, 8:52 pm  
2333 Carter Avenue  
P. O. Box 7825  
Ashland, Kentucky 41101

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. **THEREFORE, LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE AND DO NOT IMPOSE THESE REGULATIONS ON THE INTERNET AS YOU WILL AGAIN BE INTERFERING WITH ANOTHER FREEDOM OF THE AMERICAN PUBLIC, AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL ACT WHICH YOU APPARENTLY HAVE NO QUALMS WITH TAKING AWAY BUT WHICH THE AMERICAN PEOPLE RESENT.**

Peggy Rankin  
January 7, 2010, 8:54 pm  
2333 Carter Avenue  
P. O. Box 7825  
Ashland, Kentucky 41101

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Stop putting regulations on everything you can think of in order to control Americans in every phase of their life. Get out of our way and let us be free.

Larry Rapchak  
January 7, 2010, 8:56 pm  
2540 Birch Ave  
Whiting, Indiana 46394

Any attempt for a Government take-over of the Internet needs to be fully explored and debated by the U.S. Congress--and, of course, defeated!

ENOUGH of this power-hungry, imperialistic president and his Chicago-style thuggery!

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

L. Rapchak

Jonathan Rash  
January 7, 2010, 9:30 pm  
17937 E Pacific Pl  
Aurora, Colorado 80013

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Regards,

Jonathan Rash

Joanne Rasmussen  
January 7, 2010, 10:06 pm  
13603 E. Mich Ave  
Clinton, Michigan 49236

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn and increased censorship.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



William Rasmussen  
January 7, 2010, 10:18 pm  
4006 W. Maple Street  
Springfield, Missouri 65802

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,

William C. Rasmussen, III

James Rathbone  
January 7, 2010, 10:27 pm  
940 NE Raven Ct.  
Bend, Oregon 97701-8816

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This sounds very much like a communist takeover of the liberties of the USA people and the same goes for the labor union card carriers. Divide, Control and Conquer.

michael ratican  
January 7, 2010, 11:08 pm  
851 W 500 S  
Peru, Indiana 46970

Concerning GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am completely opposed to any action on the part of the commission, or any other government entity, where the internet is concerned.

No government agency, especially the FCC, should be involved in further control or regulation of the internet. I see no authority authorizing such an action granted in any portion of the U S Constitution, or other such documents, where control of citizens lives or freedoms are concerned.

As it stands, the FCC, Congress, and every government agency allows telecom companies to provide whatever service level they choose, at whatever price they choose, and if a customer has an issue, NOTHING will be done. The entire system is skewed toward these companies, and the government, so long as the telecoms continue to make "contributions" to elected officials.

In reading the NPRM, I note many areas where words such as "harm", "harmful" are used. It is ridiculous to assume that the FCC - let alone the telecom companies - should be allowed to dictate what is harmful regarding traffic and/or congestion.

As the owner of an ecommerce business, I do not trust, nor should I given the track record of the FCC and/or Congress, to provide my business with access. At every opportunity the government has refused to enforce telecom law on the telecom companies - in favor of the monies it receives from those companies. This is not a coincidence.

I have watched the government provide billions to telecom companies with a deadline - this too was under the excuse of "management" and "parody" to provide broadband access to most citizens.

It hasn't happened. And when Congress was to enforce the deadline after providing billions in tax breaks and actual funds to develop the technology - they let their friends off the hook.

The result has been a disaster. It is now 2010, and many areas have no broadband access. Those rural areas that do typically pay as much as 10x more for the service, and it's inferior to what the cities enjoy.

The government just provided hundreds of billions MORE in money to these same companies - and for what? Now they can't handle congestion.

Again - this is nothing more than a veiled attempted to initially allow telecoms to control traffic and access to the internet - and once they see profits deteriorate, the good ol' FCC will be there to help! - NO THANKS.

As a licensed amateur radio operator, I've watched the FCC carve up the spectrum like a roast for over 20 years - and every time it has, it's under the excuse of management. In fact, it's been a money making venture for the FCC, and government, with the FCC acting as "auctioneer" for portions of the spectrum.

My answer to this takeover and further control by the U S Federal Government of the internet is Hell No.

I agree with the comments included below which is a form email being sent by members of Americans for Prosperity. Please review the comments.

Sincerely,  
Michael Ratican  
Peru, IN.

-----  
  
As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Robert Ratner  
January 7, 2010, 11:39 pm  
16 Longell Drive  
Wayne, New Jersey 7470

Net neutrality is abhorrent to proponents of free speech. Let the public decide what we want on the internet. Maybe we don't want neutrality. That is our prerogative.

Also, prioritizing net traffic based upon some arbitrary government rule instead of individual business decisions promotes waste and inefficiency and discourages innovation.

Please, do not regulate the internet. You regulated power companies, cable companies, the railroads and where did it get you. None of these industries are as advanced as they could be.

Ronald Ray  
January 8, 2010, 12:04 am  
P.O. Box 152  
Maple Hill, Kansas 66507-0152

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. However, I am in favour of prohibiting all pornography, which is destructive to individuals, families, and societies, and which comprises a frightful 70% to 80% of internet traffic.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Randall readinger  
January 8, 2010, 1:13 am  
2604 Locust Road  
Ft. Scott, Kansas 66701

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will stifle or destroy business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The American people do not want an government-controlled internet and media like they have in China and Venezuela.

Rosanne Reddin  
January 8, 2010, 1:19 am  
2812 King Rook Court  
Williamsburg, Virginia 23185

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. This should NOT be contemplated in a "free" society, which I maintain the citizens of this country demand. Regulations are one thing, but government control and forced regulations implemented by a Commission with a political agenda should not be tolerated. The first thing that is done during a coup in a country by a "dictator" is the taking of the media, of which the internet is now a part. We are in a very crucial period in our country's "life" and this type of regulation would certainly be tremendously detrimental to the survival of the greatest country in the world.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and freedom of expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Mark and Karen Reed  
January 8, 2010, 6:47 am  
1875 Troy Lane North  
Plymouth, Minnesota 55447

We submit the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

mike reed  
January 8, 2010, 9:46 am  
8330 W COV GTTYSB RD  
COVINGTON, Ohio 45318

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. GET GOVERNMENT THE HELL OUT OF MY LIFE, AND INTERNET, "NOW"

Peter Reenstra  
January 8, 2010, 9:55 am  
Taylor Road  
Colchester, Connecticut 6415

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

And furthermore, altho there is no defender I can see in the Obama White House, this is a clear violation of Constitutional constraints placed on the Federal Government! this is a violation of 1st Amendment rights, and a fair court - one believing in the defense of the Constitution - would agree that FedGuv has no legitimate place in this issue.

Susan Regan  
January 8, 2010, 10:22 am  
30733 Links Court  
Temecula, California 92591

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,  
Susan Regan

Fred Regina  
January 8, 2010, 11:59 am  
6660 17th Street N  
St Petersburg, Florida 33702

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

P.S.. . . We must put America and Americans first !

Trey Reginelli  
January 8, 2010, 12:09 pm  
1306 Baronets Trl  
Austin, Texas 78753

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Debbie Rennie  
January 8, 2010, 2:03 pm  
209 Birch Dr  
Kyle, Texas 78640

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please, LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE!

Kenneth Renouard  
January 8, 2010, 2:30 pm  
242 Willow rd NW  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87107

I have read and agree with the below. There needs to be some source of free speech left to Americans. the internet is free and the individual is free to read or not read as they see fit. The internet does not represent any one entity. I fear the us government far more than any efforts of terror. no one in the federal government or any other government is wise enough to comment on the content it holds. if commerce is against the individual we can deny our support to commerce. If we disagree with the government we stand a chance of arrest. Don't you young arabs of power try to teach your elders how to suck eggs. if the government does anything it is assured citizens will suffer

ken r

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



John Renzullo  
January 8, 2010, 2:35 pm  
P.O. Box 162  
Dracut, Massachusetts 1826

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I oppose any treat to the first amendment or the bill of rights. I do not approve of localization. I want my access to information and access to opinions. This is another attempt take away our Freedom and destroys our American society.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Stephen Replogle  
January 8, 2010, 2:45 pm  
8300 Shannon Way  
Yuma, Arizona 85365

As an American, I request that the government leave the internet unregulated and free of government meddling. As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

John Revelle  
January 8, 2010, 2:57 pm  
956 Crescent Lake Rd  
Golden, Colorado 80403

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

annette rey  
January 8, 2010, 3:05 pm  
1007 paula drive  
arnold, Missouri 63010

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Where will government intervention stop?

Sincerely,  
Annette Rey

Daniel Reyneveld  
January 8, 2010, 3:06 pm  
2999 Terraza Place  
Fullerton, California 92835

As an American for prosperity, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Allison Reynolds  
January 8, 2010, 3:12 pm  
1028 E. Navajo St.  
Farmington, New Mexico 87401

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

It is unfortunate but true that governmental regulation of industries does not benefit industries or consumers but increases bureaucracy and costs. In this economy, the last thing this nation needs is more government intrusion in business and life, and more government spending on what should be a last bastion of freedom.

Steve Reynolds  
January 8, 2010, 3:23 pm  
Gunnison Way  
Broomfield, Colorado 80020

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Any transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

The November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators" should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Fran Rhodes  
January 8, 2010, 3:48 pm  
10613 Elmhurst Lane  
Keller, Texas 76244

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Government needs to stay OUT of the lives of private citizens and private enterprise!



James Rhodes  
January 8, 2010, 4:18 pm  
1414 Gracewood Drive  
Greensboro, North Carolina 27408-5330

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply NO rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In short, this is invading my privacy and I DEMAND my constitutional rights!!! The federal government MUST keep its nose out of my private business.

Kevin Rice  
January 8, 2010, 4:58 pm  
PO BOX 14107  
SAN LUIS OBISPO, California 93406-4107

OPPOSE: GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Government regulation of the Internet will interfere with the continuing evolution and freedom of the digital age. Keep government out of just one thing, please!

Net neutrality cannot be achieved by government as the mere monitoring and regulation of any activity is not neutral. Neutrality and an "Open Internet" will only be attained by free will and public and market pressure.

As an IT professional and user of the Internet I am opposed to government intrusion and demands. The Internet should be free from government force majeure.

Please oppose this proposal!

Kevin P. Rice  
San Luis Obispo CA  
(805) 602-2616

Vernon Rice  
January 8, 2010, 6:41 pm  
855 Shores St. N.E.  
Salem, Oregon 97301

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The internet comes under the Constitution and the Bill of Rights as far as freedom of speech and every thing else that goes with that. We all know the government can't even run it's own house let alone adding another house to their list. To me and many, many people I communicate with, it looks like just more government takeover for more power. Leave well enough alone. It has worked just fine without your interfearence, so let it be. It is working just fine and we do not need the government trying to control it and MUCK it up for the millions of users. Just leave it alone please. Thank you

Vernon Rice

Pamela Rich  
January 8, 2010, 8:35 pm  
3790 jFlat Top Lane  
Danville, Indiana 46122

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney. It is Unconstitutional for the government to take over the internet. Read it.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. The Government does not have the Constitutional right to control a business. A Commission does not have the right to do this period.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Michael Richardson  
January 8, 2010, 8:36 pm  
345 Jacobson Road  
Sandpoint, Idaho 83864

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Keep your governmental hands off the Internet!!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

JAck Rickett  
January 8, 2010, 9:28 pm  
22286 Monrovia road  
Orange, Virginia 22960

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Leave my communication network alone you socialist bastards

Richard Riddle  
January 8, 2010, 9:28 pm  
10718 Perry Drive N.  
Brooklyn Park, Minnesota 55443

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

As a result I am vehemently opposed to the “open internet” rules proposed. To replace the current environment and its competing forces with what will ultimately become a centralized government run utility runs counter to the principles that this country was founded on. Instead of preserving our freedom of speech and choice these regulations will put the government in charge of controlling this important communication tool which invites suppression of free speech at the whim of the unelected bureaucrat’s. Having traveled to the country of Oman recently I have had a personal experience with a government controlled internet and it was startling compared to our open infrastructure. One needs only to look at China and Venezuela to appreciate the danger in allowing a government to have control of this important communication medium.

Jeffrey Riedl  
January 8, 2010, 9:52 pm  
408 Appleton St.  
Menasha, Wisconsin 54952

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Constitution of the United States, the document which each government official swears to uphold and defend, clearly states that we have been endowed by our creator with the unalienable rights of freedom of speech, and freedom to assemble. The internet provides a modern-day vehicle for these rights to be exercised.

There are unquestionably mis-uses of the internet, and there are without a doubt, uses that every online participant deems undesirable - but it is ultimately a good thing and we can take care of ourselves just fine thank you.

A transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Michael Riemann  
January 8, 2010, 11:14 pm  
5536 Odum Smallwood Rd.  
Gainesville, Georgia 30506

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The internet is a forum where freedom of speech, one of our basic freedoms, is still possible.

I strongly urge you to not abridge this precious freedom through any act, however intentioned, that will place this medium under further constraint and control.

In the long run the erosion of freedom will harm all citizens, even those who perpatrator those unwise changes.

MJR

Kathy Riemer  
January 8, 2010, 11:15 pm  
476 Sheridan Rd  
Evanston, Illinois 60202

As a concerned citizen, and business owner involved in Internet technologies, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional phone and traditional cable companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming a viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense. This would pose an unnecessary risk to the most dynamic segment of the market.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. This should be determined by a free marketplace.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Tony Rigby  
January 8, 2010, 11:21 pm  
328 E. Knoll Ct.  
Eagle, Idaho 83616

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Pamela Rigg  
January 9, 2010, 3:06 am  
11590 W Purdue Ave  
Youngtown, Arizona 85363

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Let the free market do it's thing. We want to be a democratic society. This is what they do in a socialist country. Leave us alone!!!!!!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

scott riley  
January 9, 2010, 8:08 am  
25 chestnut street  
haddonfield, New Jersey 8033

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Daniel Rinehart  
January 9, 2010, 8:47 am  
578 Rogers Ct.  
Adrian, Michigan 49221

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The Government needs to DOWNSIZE, not grow. The Internet works fine the way it is, there is NO need for things to change!!!

Jeanette Rinke  
January 9, 2010, 9:43 am  
416-4 Harrison Street  
Fond du Lac, Wisconsin 54937

Keep the Internet competitive and not a government run utility. Keep out of our private business.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mary Anne Ripple  
January 9, 2010, 10:14 am  
grankonloverslane@hotmail.com  
MadisonWI, Wisconsin 53711

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

I do not favor the government takeover of the internet.  
Please leave this private business alone.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Robert Rixford  
January 9, 2010, 10:14 am  
8725 Isola Dr  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89117

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I believe Government control of the Internet is just one more area that the current Administration is determined to put under government control.

I still have not been able to find anywhere in the Constitution where that power has been given to any branch of the government.

I have a hard time distinguishing how this effort is different, in any substantive way, from the government attempting to regulate the content of newspapers, magazines, periodicals, or newsletters.

The Internet is highly competitive; both with regard to the 'Providers' and content. If a website or Forum contains material that not enough people care about, or agree with, the marketplace will determine who survives, and who doesn't. That's as it should be - not decided by some Czar chosen for how well his or her ideas fall in line with the 'Power that be.'

Once the government exercises control over the Internet (or, anything else, for that matter), there is virtually no way to wrest control away from them. One notch at a time, we are ratcheted into a Socialist State.

From a more practical viewpoint, and to get away from my vehement opposition to the government thinking they (it) can run anything better than the free market system, let me express more pertinent concerns.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

MK Roach  
January 9, 2010, 11:59 am  
2597 Lithia Road  
Buchanan, Virginia 24066

As an American activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

At the present time the Internet is highly competitive and has been so for the past decade. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers; For the US Government to do so would be an unconstitutional interference with the right to free speech. See Google's struggle with China's governmental censure for an example.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that are economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then become crippled, supplying an opportunity for the government to "rescue" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

I oppose the transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility; this is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

The dire claims advanced by advocates of so-called "net neutrality" should be heavily discounted, if not ignored entirely. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could slow down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Barbara Robbins  
January 9, 2010, 12:24 pm  
10 N 7th Ave,  
PO Box 13  
Iron River, Michigan 49935-0013

As an Independent Business Owner who is deaf, I function and pay taxes to support Michigan and the federal Government only BECAUSE OF and WITH the Internet options available to me NOW, as a productive individual who helps other Independent Business Owners create taxpaying enterprises, as well.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I submit the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank you.

Barbara Robbins  
January 9, 2010, 12:44 pm  
10 N 7th Ave PO Box 13  
Iron River, Michigan 499350013

In 1949, this family's sixth consecutive generation of American entrepreneurs opened a quality-guaranteed typing service to individual medical researchers. Now internet-based, experience in independent business, respected military, and compassionate volunteer leadership continues, while our family's eighth generation serves also in employee positions.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I submit the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ron Roberds  
January 9, 2010, 1:32 pm  
9077 Wasatch Bl.  
Sandy, Utah 84093

It is too bad the government has to be watched so carefully, but history shows it can't be trusted. As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Brenda Roberts  
January 9, 2010, 1:44 pm  
1712 West Swallow Road  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80526

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I never thought I'd live to see the day when, in America, freedom of speech and open debate of ideas would be brought to a stop. This is not the American way.

J P Roberts  
January 9, 2010, 1:49 pm  
12529 Flora Dr  
Missoula, Montana 59804

As an Americans, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

mike roberts  
January 9, 2010, 3:02 pm  
17732 black bass dr  
Conroe, Texas 77384

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Federal government has a job to do and controlling the internet is not part of that job ! WASHINGTON SHOULD STAY OUT OF OUR LIVES !



Charley Robertson  
January 9, 2010, 6:24 pm  
2664 Choctaw Trail  
Marianna, Florida 32446

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

My comment is: Good grief!! everything that the government has got involved with is screwed up. Now you want to destroy the internet? Please leave the internet alone, you have done enough damage already.

cory robertson  
January 9, 2010, 7:13 pm  
7 joyce  
addison, Illinois 60101

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

We dont want open internet/controlled internet!

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Brian Robichaud  
January 9, 2010, 7:17 pm  
2815 Walsh  
Rochester Hills, Michigan 48309

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS OUT OF CONTROL AND OVER-REACHING IN POWER, BEYOND THE INTENT OF THE FOUNDING FATHERS. YOUR PROPOSAL TO CONTROL THE INTERNET IS JUST ONE MORE EXAMPLE.

DOOM ON YOU MARXIST FED !!

BRIAN ROBICHAUD

James Robinson  
January 9, 2010, 8:25 pm  
411 North 21st Street  
Springfield, Michigan 49015-1501

"As an email Americans for Prosperity activist, I submit the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

"The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional 'phone' and traditional 'cable' companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic, maliciously, it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

"The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

"The Internet would then either remain crippled or be 'rescued' with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this 'public utility' model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

"Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

"I am especially concerned that the Commission already contemplates Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that ultimately, the Commission may be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

"Advocates of so-called 'net neutrality' have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called 'Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators') that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become."

Lawrence Robinson  
January 9, 2010, 8:43 pm  
13 Norwood Place  
Boise, Idaho 83716

## NO MORE BIG GOVERNMENT TAKEOVERS OF ANYTHING!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ralph Robinson  
January 10, 2010, 4:07 am  
128 Windsor Road  
Alburtis, Pennsylvania 18011

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,  
Ralph Robinson

Breanne Rochester  
January 10, 2010, 6:59 am  
Rt. 3 Box 46  
Hamilton, Texas 76531

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The internet does not need to be controlled by any government entity.

bernard rodefer  
January 10, 2010, 7:15 am  
25229 Oriole Avn  
Ontario, Wisconsin 54651

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. In other words, we do not want this regulation or the government sticking its nose in this so they can restrict free information or further subdue information that is not flattering to abusive government practices!



Adam Roder  
January 10, 2010, 7:20 am  
3302 Evergreen Rd  
Fargo, North Dakota 58102

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Gifford Rodine  
January 10, 2010, 9:00 am  
922 Loma Vista St.  
El Segundo, California 90245

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I agree, Gifford Rodine

Mary Roe  
January 10, 2010, 9:03 am  
1367 E. Cody-Estey  
Pinconning, Michigan 48650

I am opposed to the attempt of the FCC and the Obama Administration to regulate the free flow of information on the internet. Nowhere in the US Constitution is the government given any authority to control or regulate free speech, free enterprise or free information exchange. Government takeover of the internet would cripple our free enterprise system and would make America less free. It would disconnect Americans and hurt American businesses that depend on the internet. I urge you to support a truly open, free internet that is competitive and privately owned without the restrictions of the government. The job of the government is to preserve that freedom, not destroy it.

Sue Roe  
January 10, 2010, 10:51 am  
3990 N Berkshire lane  
Martinsville, Indiana 46151

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

John Roebling  
January 10, 2010, 11:32 am  
622 Prospect St  
Weston, Missouri 64098

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Leave the internet alone.

Gary Roen  
January 10, 2010, 1:22 pm  
P.O. Box 243  
Twin Lake, Michigan 49457

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Enacting such a measure would be a major step toward eliminating the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights of the Constitution. Although this Commission is not a duly designated legislative faction, this intrusion will ultimately lead to the suppression of free speech. This contention is supported by the fact that this administration in particular, has repeatedly displayed its disdain for the limited powers outlined in the Constitution by its appointment of numerous individuals with unrestrained powers and allegiance only to the White House, who may function at will as legislators EX-OFFICIO. We do not need more intrusion, creating a problem to address where no problem originally existed, by a government that CAN NOT and WILL NOT police itself within the confines of our own Constitution.

Mike Rogers  
January 10, 2010, 1:50 pm  
76 ow Rd  
Hollis, New Hampshire 3049

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Personal comments...

Networks that don't work: Amtrak, Post Office.

Networks that work: The Internet, Cellular services.

Guess which were frozen in time and space by the government?

In the same years that the alarmists have been crying that they needed "Net Neutrality" or similar regulations, the range of services and speeds available to the public has increased exponentially, even as prices fell. My personal internet service has quintupled in speed for less money, and the reliability (as evidenced by the quality of VoIP calls over the broadband connection) has improved. Meanwhile, DSL and satellite services, not to mention 3G cellular, aggressively compete to take my business away from the cable company, who wouldn't be so stupid as to mess with my traffic.

More and constantly changing regulations = less innovation.

Bah, Humbug!

Please do not regulate Internet traffic - Keep It Simple, Stupid!

John Rohrer  
January 10, 2010, 2:49 pm  
3216 Sykesville Rd.  
Westminster, Maryland 21157

Stop your facist power-grab!!!!!!!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Lise Rollert  
January 10, 2010, 7:18 pm  
1614 26th Street  
Ogden, Utah 84401

As a concerned citizen and a proponent of free market economics, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, such "public utility" models are currently in place in other "Western" governments and they are inefficient and costly to the taxpayers. It again provides opportunities for the type of corrupt political power plays at the forefront of our Congressional agenda today.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

This intervention is an anathema upon any robust economic activity and unwarranted. How is such control even pertinent in our form of government?

Craig Rollins  
January 10, 2010, 7:55 pm  
2402 N Washougal River Road  
Washougal, Washington 98671

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I urge you to not act on any legislation to restrict the internet as a 'free-market' tool.

Sincerely,  
Craig Rollins

Clive Romney  
January 10, 2010, 8:22 pm  
1258 W. Pitchfork Road  
Murray, Utah 84123

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. But if government were to exercise control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent economically efficient business models. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Donald Rose  
January 11, 2010, 8:49 am  
1024 Tideline Drive  
Leland, North Carolina 28451

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Louis Rose  
January 11, 2010, 10:51 am  
6753 Orkney Road  
Jacksonville, Florida 32211

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Government is by its very nature incompetent to manage entrepreneurial endeavors.

Leave the internet alone. It is a free market and is working just fine.

We don't want another set of taxes imposed.

Stop

Let the market decide who will be successful and who will fail.

Do not screw up a system that works so well.

Chris Rosenau  
January 11, 2010, 10:59 am  
P.O. Box 478  
Lolo, Montana 59847

As an Americans for Prosperity supporter, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Charles Ross  
January 11, 2010, 11:17 am  
1076 Sycamore Dr.  
Millbrae, California 94030

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Government, keep your hands off the internet

David Ross  
January 11, 2010, 11:25 am  
14925 Gleneagle Drive  
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80921

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dave Ross



Debra Ross  
January 11, 2010, 12:15 pm  
394 Penfield Road  
Rochester, New York 14625

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional phone and traditional cable companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Lou Rotolo  
January 11, 2010, 1:14 pm  
32 Miko Rd  
Edison, New Jersey 8817

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions.

There is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James Roundtree  
January 11, 2010, 1:22 pm  
8220 Old Gay Hill Rd  
Brenham, Texas 77833-8830

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Judy Rountree  
January 11, 2010, 1:32 pm  
400 Fort Hill Dr  
Blounts Creek, North Carolina 27814

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The Iran government tried to do this to their citizens and now the Iran people is in the process of over throwing it's radical government. Let's not make the same mistake here in the US.

k rountree  
January 11, 2010, 2:18 pm  
75 brookview lane  
Valparaiso, Indiana 46385

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Furthermore, as a voter and tax payer, I am extremely uncomfortable with the idea of our government continuing to find new ways to get involved in our professional and private lives.

Ann Roush  
January 11, 2010, 3:03 pm  
4315 Greenbrier Farm Rd.  
Winston-Salem, North Carolina 27106

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Barbara Rowland  
January 11, 2010, 3:04 pm  
6715 E malverne St  
Inverness, Florida 34452

Leave the internet ALONE. The government already is in too much of our business. You ruin everything you touch. Leave us alone.

Barbara Royer  
January 11, 2010, 3:16 pm  
2700 Hampton Park Drive  
Marietta, Georgia 30062

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The U. S. Federal government should stay out of American and international business and personal affairs.



Jennifer Ruble  
January 11, 2010, 3:20 pm  
128 St. Ives Court  
Clayton, North Carolina 27520

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Russell M Ruch  
January 11, 2010, 5:22 pm  
459 Butler Ave  
Hatfield, Pennsylvania 19440

A free avenue for expressions by individual citizens is an essential characteristic of strong democracies. Do nothing to close this open opportunity of expression. Keep the Internet unregulated and open to individuals.

Robert Ruh Jr.  
January 11, 2010, 5:36 pm  
278 Wedgewood Court  
Westerville, Ohio 43082

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. If the members of the present Commission insist on this course of action, they can and will be removed, and their ill-advised actions repealed.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. The government has no reason to do this, other than to push its own liberal agenda. Nor does it have the right to do so, other than to grow government and strangle opposition. If liberals cannot make a convincing case for their brain-dead policies, they have no legitimate business forcing people to listen to their warped, hate-filled rants - least of all, in the name of "fairness". Apparently this proposal's backers can tolerate anything but opposition.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. So-called "net neutrality" is just another liberal power-grab, another attempt to take away freedom, and another attempt to force taxpayers to pay for liberal wet dreams.

RONALD & NANCY RUHL  
January 11, 2010, 5:53 pm  
1866 SALLY CREEK CIRCLE  
HAYWARD, California 94541

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Louis Rulon  
January 11, 2010, 6:39 pm  
5654 E. Forest st.  
APACHE JUNCTION, Arizona 85219

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Enough is enough, your time is short socialists.

LOUIS H. RULON

Mary Rumph  
January 11, 2010, 6:51 pm  
325 Asbury Circle  
Enid, Oklahoma 73703

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.]

Sincerely,  
Mary Rumph

Laurence Rusiecki  
January 11, 2010, 6:52 pm  
120 Ruby Drive  
Egg Harbor Twp, New Jersey 8234

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

THEY TRIED GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF THE MEDIA IN THE SOVIET UNION AND IN NAZI GERMANY!  
ANYONE WITH HALF-A-BRAIN SHOULD REALIZE THAT GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF MASS MEDIA SUCH AS  
THE INTERNET IS A DAGGER IN THE HEART OF FREE SPEECH!

Joseph Russek  
January 11, 2010, 7:48 pm  
4200 Highwood Rd  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20906

The US Government should not interfere with my ability to communicate. As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



H R Russell  
January 11, 2010, 8:41 pm  
8752 Meriwether Trail  
Grady, Alabama 360236

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I'll make it really simple. Keep government hands off. If government gets involved, government will screw it up.

Respectfully, Russell

Mark Ryalls  
January 11, 2010, 9:27 pm  
4350 Williams Rd.  
Lewisville, North Carolina 27023

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I am against the government taking over "one" more facet of our freedoms. Just butt out!

michael Ryan  
January 11, 2010, 11:26 pm  
13725 se 177th ave  
Damascus, Oregon 97089

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I didn't serve my country to preserve our freedoms just to have them seized from within.

Robert Rynes  
January 12, 2010, 1:05 am  
5046 Whitemarsh Rd  
Rosedale, Maryland 21237

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

**KEEP THE INTERNET FREE!!!!**

Rosalie Sabatino  
January 12, 2010, 7:25 am  
36 Pitman Place  
Wayne, New Jersey 7470

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This exhibits governments arrogance at the expense of America's business owners and the American people. Our liberties and freedoms are being chiseled away but make no mistake we do know what you are doing and we will continue to fight back.

JAMES SADLON  
January 12, 2010, 10:20 am  
5150 FARMINGTON CLOSE  
ROCKFORD, Illinois 61114

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. IN THE ABSENCE OF CONCRETE EVIDENCE OF DISCRIMATORY OR ANTI-COMPETITIVE BEHAVIOR, THERE IS SIMPLY NO RATIONALE FOR IMPOSING ANY NEW REGULATIONS THAT COULD HAVE THE EFFECT OF SLOWING DOWN THE GREATEST ENGINE OF INNOVATION, GROWTH, AND EXPRESSION THAT THE LIGHTLY REGULATED, COMPETITIVE INTERNET HAS BECOME.

Ellen Sadovy  
January 12, 2010, 10:22 am  
8601 Mangum Dairy Road  
Wake Forest, North Carolina 27587

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jack Saint  
January 12, 2010, 10:28 am  
98 Rainbow Drive  
Dadeville, Alabama 36853

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Keep the government out of the internet!



kenneth salvo  
January 12, 2010, 2:04 pm  
15 orchard place  
basking ridge, New Jersey 7920

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thanks for reading this and please put an end to talk of this regulation.  
Kenneth Salvo

Dr. Ronald Samec  
January 12, 2010, 3:41 pm  
29 Shore Drive  
Greenville, South Carolina 28611

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ron Samec

Gregory Sanders  
January 12, 2010, 4:01 pm  
524 N Locust St  
Greenville, Illinois 62246

PLEASE READ! As an Americans for Prosperity supporter, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

RJ Sanderson  
January 12, 2010, 4:17 pm  
329 w 24  
Hays, Kansas 67601

"I will take a backseat to no one in my commitment to Net Neutrality." I think I heard that in Venezuela, Cuba, Communist Russia, perhaps North Korea??...the Marxist agent's name was...I forget. Well I digress.

Dear Marxist/Socialist:

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sam Sandlin  
January 12, 2010, 4:21 pm  
POB 279  
Sarepta, Louisiana 71071

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Everything boils down to smaller, not larger government. Government involvement always deters progress, free enterprise, more taxpayer money, innovation and the list goes on and on and on. GET OUT OF OUR LIVES AND OUR WALLETS, GOVERNMENT. Try acting according to the restrictions levied on Federal Government by our Constitution. Say, that WOULD be a change, wouldn't it!!!!

Dom Sanguiliano  
January 12, 2010, 4:31 pm  
30 Red Oak Way  
Bridgewater, New Jersey 8807

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Patrick Santavenere  
January 12, 2010, 4:32 pm  
1608 Elligson Road  
Rosedale, Maryland 21237

Keep you hands off the internet!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sandy Santiago  
January 12, 2010, 4:56 pm  
17 Ski Hill Drive  
Bedminster, New Jersey 7921

As an American who values the freedom of the internet, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



LaJeana Sapp  
January 12, 2010, 4:57 pm  
1192 Lark Rd.  
Joplin, Missouri 64804

I am commenting on the preservation of the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Government needs to quit trying to takeover enterprises, which the internet is. Some regulation can be positive in some situations. However, what's being proposed will only lead to a government-run internet that will be neither unbiased or truthful.

Please stop this venture to preserve free speech as it was intended.

Lynn Savron  
January 12, 2010, 5:08 pm  
20187 Winding Trail  
Strongsville, Ohio 44149

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Christopher Sawyer  
January 12, 2010, 5:09 pm  
33649 Bernadine Dr.  
Farmington Hills, Michigan 48335

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We don't live in Communist China, gentlemen. We live in the United States of America. Keep the Internet free of government interference.

Elizabeth Sawyer  
January 12, 2010, 5:13 pm  
2845 Oakview Ln N  
Plymouth, Minnesota 55441

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The internet is highly competitive. Traditional “telephone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive internet has become.

We simply don't need government control of the internet or freedom of expression.

Thank you for your consideration.

John Saxon  
January 12, 2010, 5:14 pm  
118 Cheshire Road  
Hudson, Ohio 44236

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Steve Saxon  
January 12, 2010, 5:15 pm  
somewhere in Ca.  
Le Grand, California 95333

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

It's all the same folks, internet take over, socialized healthcare, etc. It's simply about power over the people by a few elitists. Only chance we have is to shake up both houses of congress this Nov. I am ashamed of both so called republicans and democrats right now. They vote their selves a raise yet for the first time do not give SS recipients a cost of living raise. I am first and foremost a conservative and I will never quit bugging my reps by phone or email on things that limit my rights given to me in our constitution. Big government must be stopped and put back in it's place in a peacefull way of course by our VOTES! Wake up America you snooze you loose.

Thomas Scalise  
January 12, 2010, 5:35 pm  
1855 W. S.R. 434  
Longwood, Florida 32750

In line with Americans for Prosperity, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jean Scarborough  
January 12, 2010, 5:59 pm  
13242 Teague Road  
Saucier, Mississippi 39574

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Brad Schaeffer  
January 12, 2010, 6:07 pm  
12010 Laurel Road  
Chesterland, Ohio 44026

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am not only an IT expert; I am the owner of a small computer and networking business. I have more than a cursory understanding of how the Internet works.

We suggest providers that work well and explain what doesn't work well with others. Providers that made any attempt to censor, block, restrict or enhance specific traffic have and would be damaged by those actions within the scope of the free market.

The existing system works and the government is looking to fix a problem that doesn't exist.

I have read the proposal and based on the text, damage could and I expect likely will be done to not only the performance and openness of the current structure, but to many providers and consumers of the related products and industries.

This intrusion is unacceptable, unnecessary and must be stopped.

Thank you, Brad Schaeffer

Dorothy Schafer  
January 12, 2010, 6:17 pm  
12 Oak Park Dr.  
Madisonville, Louisiana 70447

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,

Dorothy Schafer

scott & monica schaffer  
January 12, 2010, 6:45 pm  
826 george st.  
valparaiso, Indiana 46385-3302

As Americans for Prosperity activists, we hereby submit the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Government control and politicization of the Internet is absolutely unacceptable. The transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anticompetitive behavior, there is no good reason to impose new regulations that could slow down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the Internet has become.

Katherine Schaper  
January 12, 2010, 6:51 pm  
7302 Cold Harbor Court  
Fairview, Tennessee 37062

Stop the Madness - Keep the GOVERNMENT out of our Private Lives. As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Michelle Schick  
January 12, 2010, 7:28 pm  
317 Delavan Street  
Lincoln, Illinois 62656

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please - Leave the internet alone and free of government intervention.

Milton Schick  
January 12, 2010, 7:38 pm  
4835 N. Valley Park  
Tucson, Arizona 85705

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Cheryl Schlegel  
January 12, 2010, 8:24 pm  
5466 Oakvilla Manor Drive  
St. Louis, Missouri 63129

As a concerned American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Alan Schmidt  
January 12, 2010, 8:27 pm  
2512 157th Street  
Gardena, California 90249

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Andrea Schmitt  
January 12, 2010, 8:34 pm  
17721 Buehler Road  
Olney, Maryland 20832

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

David and Lois Schmittinger  
January 12, 2010, 8:57 pm  
615 South Grantie Street #C  
Prescott, Arizona 86303

Remember \$10 for Tark as you my comments which means I will give \$10 to defeat you in the next election if you continue to ram rod your socialistic ideas on sensorship.

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank you for considering my opinion which I want to be able to continue to express i.e. the freedom of speech!

David and Lois Schmittinger

Edwin and Donna Schmitz  
January 12, 2010, 9:06 pm  
705 Elm Lane  
Grand Junction, Colorado 80507

As American for Prosperity citizens, we are submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

We are especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

james schmitz  
January 12, 2010, 9:21 pm  
19241 farlin road  
parker, Kansas 66072

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Leave things alone or pay the price.

Jerome Schmitz  
January 12, 2010, 9:26 pm  
31647 Greenfield Road  
Vermillion, South Dakota 57069

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The internet has become a huge success because it began as a new medium not hindered by government limitations or incentives which affect the course of other mediums daily. This has allowed individuals and business to be creative and competitive. Let this medium continue to be free of intervention from individuals who impose their version of "good will" and "just intent". Otherwise, it too will become a football which changes color and size based upon the wishes of individuals which come and go as governments change. No medium can flourish under those conditions.

Thank you.  
Jerome Schmitz

William Schnarel  
January 12, 2010, 9:27 pm  
312 Dennis Rd.  
Lipan, Texas 76462

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,  
Wm. Jeffrey Schnarel

John Schneider  
January 12, 2010, 9:59 pm  
39444 Main Street  
Eaton, Colorado 80615

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ray Schneider  
January 12, 2010, 10:00 pm  
77 Middlebrook St.  
Harrisonburg, Virginia 22801

The government move to regulate the internet is another unconstitutional move. The internet is a open network environment and government intrusion is unnecessary and imperils freedom of speech.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Steven Schoch  
January 12, 2010, 10:28 pm  
4524 Slater Ct  
Quincy, Illinois 62305

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Steven Schoch

Stephen Schoen  
January 12, 2010, 10:48 pm  
2992 E Lexington Ave  
Gilbert, Arizona 85234

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Call it what you may, the recent envisioned "controls and regulations" on the internet are an infringement of the American public freedom of speech and free enterprise greatness. Any proposed changes must be trumpeted loudly and get the larger American public approval before moving forward.

A subversive transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Carl Schoeneberger  
January 12, 2010, 10:48 pm  
5922 Bent Trl  
Dallas, Texas 75248

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

What we have today is an Internet that works, it is competitive, and most importantly, IT IS NOT BROKEN. Please do not try to "fix" it or make it better. The cost of Internet service is astonishingly low considering the service provided. When governments run telephone service the rates are high and if you manipulate the Internet as described below it will lead to government control, inefficiency and bring those kind of rates back. Then you will somehow make it become a burden to the already overburdened taxpayers. There is no need to make the Internet "Open", it is plenty open already. There is no free lunch, someone in the end has to pay, or else service that you claim is "equal and fair" for everyone (which sounds just swell to the naive) ends up leaving everyone with a mediocre, expensive, government run debacle. I request you do not do this. There is NO evidence that it is needed, and if there were your proposed "fix" will cause much more damage than any so called "Open" benefits.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Carl Scholten  
January 12, 2010, 10:53 pm  
2615 Pickens St  
Montrose, California 91020

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that are economically efficient. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is an infringement on right to free speech, free trade, and a major policy change that should be debated in Congress as the elected legislative branch of government. The Commission shall not set into motion regulatory changes that will violate constitutional protections, and force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Judy Schroeder Watrous  
January 12, 2010, 10:53 pm  
2711 W Main St  
Louisville, Kentucky 40212

I am not now and never will be an Americans for Prosperity activist, so I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I have read information from both sides on this debate. I've decided that the more truthful points are being made in favor of "net neutrality." Although it is apparently true, as Phil Kerpen from Americans for Prosperity and Newsmax say, that competition is intense among media companies, phone and cable, isn't it MORE American to ensure that this great playing field of the internet remains accessible to all players?

Like television and radio "airwaves", electronic communications must have "public access" and strong FCC rules to guarantee that access.

I think Mr. Kerpen is disingenuous when he says in his Newsmax email that we all need to fight against your rulings because "as long as the Internet is free, we can use it to communicate, educate, and organize." However, in the petition he wants me to sign at the Americans for Prosperity website his arguments are clearly in defense of corporations and against "restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments their current investments." Clearly he is talking about "free enterprise" for the few corporations that are currently in control of the market.

It would certainly be a problem should the FCC ever be stacked with Commissioners who "blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously...." But, again, I disagree with Americans for Prosperity that it was be harder to correct this policy in the public domain than the supposedly self-regulating corporate marketplace.

No, I ask that you as our public Commissioners accept responsibility for enacting strong rules that keep the Internet free from the chance of corporate blocking, censorship and discrimination. Ensure that Internet service providers disclose all efforts to manage content, as proposed, and protect "Net Neutrality."

Ben Schudel  
January 12, 2010, 11:20 pm  
6511 Vine St  
Lincoln, Nebraska 68505

I oppose needless regulation of the internet. The current proposal would seem to put an artificial condition on the internet which would limit the ability of free market forces to select only those services which are economically viable. If there is a demand for the individuals expressing themselves via email or blogs there will be a service to support such activity.

Adine Schuelke  
January 12, 2010, 11:21 pm  
2840 91st Street  
Sturtevant, Wisconsin 53177

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mrs. Sylvia Schultz  
January 12, 2010, 11:48 pm  
2780 Beemerville Road  
Compton, Illinois 61318

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

**THIS ADMINISTRATION HAS ALREADY DONE TOO MUCH AGAINST OUR CONSTITUTION. WE ARE NOW WELL ON OUR WAY TO BECOMING A SOCIALIST-DICTATORSHIP. STOP IN GOD'S NAME!**



Pamela Schvey  
January 12, 2010, 11:55 pm  
Millburn Avenue  
Millburn, New Jersey 7041

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Keep government out of my personal life.

Brian Schwartz  
January 13, 2010, 12:00 am  
4339 Pembroke Gardnes  
Boulder, Colorado 80301

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

If government makes sure the Internet is "open," then it has the power to close it to politically unpopular parties. The companies that maintain the Internet's infrastructure and allow data traffic have the right to use their property as they see fit. Government has no right to control other people's property.

As Americans for Prosperity has written:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Shirley Scott  
January 13, 2010, 12:39 am  
126 Staffordshire Dr  
New Bern, North Carolina 28562

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I don't want total control of every aspect of my life by the government. Nor should my tax dollars be used for this abuse of power.

John Scuba  
January 13, 2010, 2:34 am  
4725 Champions Way  
Columbus, Georgia 31909

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If and when a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would certainly lose its customers. However, when government gets the power to exercise control over the Internet, there would be no place for Americans to turn.

The notion envisioned for "burden of proof" for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably mean complete government control along with politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including the wildly outlandish ideas of former White House adviser Susan Crawford and "Free Press" (only free if it's GOVERNMENT FREE) founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a dangerous major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not and in my opinion has no regulatory right to set into motion regulatory changes that will force Americans down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells (crying wolf!) now for many years. Starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators", such claims as these should be patently discounted or disregarded out of hand. As there is complete absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the ultimate and immediate effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly (or UN) regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I close by saying that government has: 1) no hand in anything "neutral" or "free"; and 2) when the government's hand is introduced, that which is or was free or neutral has by definition lost those very admirable traits.

Nelson Secord  
January 13, 2010, 5:07 am  
10660 Silver Lake Mich  
Brighton, Michigan 48116-8603

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Government control will end freedom of expression and hence our liberty.

elizabeth sedgwick  
January 13, 2010, 6:36 am  
1253 buckhead circle  
birmingham, Alabama 35216

KEEP the federal govenment OUT of our lives! This is America, you are attempting to make it a government run country---  
this is despicable

K Sedgwick  
January 13, 2010, 6:45 am  
329 E. 75th St.  
New York, New York 10021

## ENOUGH WITH YOUR VEILED SOCIALISM!!!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

jenny Seibert  
January 13, 2010, 6:46 am  
3 Beechwood Drive  
Wheeling, West Virginia 26003

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

STOP TRYING TO TAKE AWAY OUR FREEDOMS. WE DO NOT BELIEVE THAT YOU "KNOW BETTER THAN WE DO" WHAT IS BEST FOR US.



Carole Seidel  
January 13, 2010, 6:55 am  
334 Winter Quarters Drive  
Pocomoke City, Maryland 21851

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Linda Self  
January 13, 2010, 6:59 am  
114 Maude Lane  
Mount Airy, North Carolina 27030

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

As it should be in a "free enterprise" country, the Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers. Wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. A private company should not block or censor Internet traffic maliciously if so, it would lose its customers. Government should not block or censor any part of the internet used by private citizens.

The burden of proof for requiring network management practices should not be unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that usually are economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

We do not need for the Internet to be either crippled or have to be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Lloyd Sellers  
January 13, 2010, 6:59 am  
PO Box 754  
268 Sellers Road  
Sylva, North Carolina 28779-0754

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jason and Karen Sensenig  
January 13, 2010, 6:59 am  
5568 80th Pl  
Pinellas Park, Florida 33781

As Americans for Prosperity activist, we are submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

JAMES SERNA III  
January 13, 2010, 6:59 am  
732 BRIDGE RD  
732 BRIDGE RD  
SAN LEANDRO, California 94577

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

As a heavy user of the internet for both domestic and international communications, I am deeply concerned about the Government's proposal to control the internet. I have not found the current internet setup to be lacking choices of ISPs for users like me, and I've had first-hand experience with governments who totally control and censor internet access and communications.

While that is not the stated intent of the U.S. Government's proposals in the referenced Dockets, the provisions of those proposals would make it too simple for the Government to take total control of internet access and internet content.

I urge you not to approve the Government's proposals outlined in GN Docket 09-191 and WC Docket 07-52.

Deeply Concerned For Our Constitutional Freedoms,

James Serna III

Scott Seward  
January 13, 2010, 7:06 am  
8225 Avenida Castro  
Rancho Cucamonga, California 91730

As a free American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Robert Seymour  
January 13, 2010, 7:13 am  
127 Miramonte Drive  
Moraga, California 94556

As Americans for Prosperity advocate, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

NJ Sh  
January 13, 2010, 7:24 am  
39425 King Edward Ct.  
Willoughby, Ohio 44094

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. PROTECT FREEDOMS...DO NOT TAKE OR RISK FREEDOM!!!!



Michael Shaffer  
January 13, 2010, 7:48 am  
803 Runner Oak Street  
Celebration, Florida 34747

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, is not the a viable answer.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent businesses from being economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells; however, this only rings of "control" over the freedom of speech. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I strongly object to these efforts of the "Open Internet" proposed policies...please do not allow this to proceed.

shane shane

January 13, 2010, 7:51 am

australia

adelaide, Washington 253/564

It's just another step by the USA to rule the world by stealth. The puppet masters in the US have always wanted to take over the world and its citizens are just as bad for allowing it to happen. They appear to believe that the USA is the world. The rest of the world is not happy. The US is the only nation on earth who believes that it has the right to invade any country it disagrees with or has a financial stake in. It has invaded over 60 countries since the Vietnam conflict using various excuses. The latest excuse is the so called war on terror. The true terrorists are the US itself who bully, threaten and ultimately invade countries who they disagree with. The internet is the last source of the truth (if you can sort it out from the bullshit) and free communication. All other forms of media is controlled and corrupted by the power brokers and the puppet masters. Just like in the movies, judgement day is coming. The war for true freedom of expression is still raging and the US is its biggest enemy. this is a warning to all those who believe in free press and honest communication. BEWARE the US gov is coming to take you away.

Nancie Shauger  
January 13, 2010, 7:53 am  
191 East Main Street  
New Castle, Colorado 81647

As an American Citizen and Taxpayer who strongly endorses the activities of "Americans for Prosperity", I support the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet, GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52, and have added my personal opinion in the last two paragraphs:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I am vehemently opposed to the government having any control over the Internet. Land and cell phone service, cable and satellite, gas and electric...all of them are exorbitantly priced and less competitive because of government fees, taxes, regulations, etc. In general, INTERFERENCE! Geez, we just got rid of the Spanish-American War tax on our phone bills!

In addition, taxpayer subsidies, i.e. the FCC taking MY tax dollars to sprinkle where THEY see fit is not only arbitrary and "taxation without representation" but enables poorly run entities to then become "too big to fail." Have we learned NOTHING? A healthy, competitive, free market will naturally weed out lesser performing companies, thinning the herd and improving the gene pool, duh! And Lord knows we still have plenty of attorneys and ridiculously generous juries for anyone unfortunate or dumb or lazy enough to stay on such sinking ships. Get your hands off FREE ENTERPRISE!!

Ben Shaw  
January 13, 2010, 8:01 am  
390 Mira Mar Ave  
Long Beach, California 90814

I am commenting today because I want the Internet to remain as it is, with no further government control or regulation...GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

John Shea  
January 13, 2010, 8:04 am  
2825 Einstein Drive  
Virginia Beach, Virginia 23456

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Federal Government is not doing a very good job running all the things they do now. There are too many people with selfish interests to fairly govern the people who elected them. We elected these people thinking they were going to represent us, at this point in time they are not representing the people. They shouldn't be allowed to take over the Internet.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Cheryl Sheen  
January 13, 2010, 8:04 am  
1928 Sheen Hollow  
Otsego, Michigan 49078

I am writing regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is becoming another alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic it would lose customers. If the government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no options. The burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and could create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the profits on investments in building network capacity. This could cause some of those investments to not be economically feasible.

The Internet could have problems which could eventually lead to government intervention and control. This government control is what many proponents of regulation, such as Susan Crawford and Robert McChesney would like to have happen. This should be decided by Congress, not by unelected government officials or a commission. I am concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Without concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the innovation, growth, and expression that the Internet now has.

Fulton Sheen  
January 13, 2010, 8:11 am  
1928 Sheen Hollow  
Otsego, Michigan 49078

#### FCC Regulation of the Internet

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am a former 3-term MI state legislator, 2-term County Treasurer and have been a small business owner of a financial planning practice with my wife for over 20 years. Currently, I involved in bringing new products and systems to the market, and am over several faith-based 501 (c) organizations one ministers to Native Americans and the other is a disaster relief group. I am also a FEMA certified trainer and have on the MI NFIB Leadership Council since 1992. The reason I listed all this is to let you know all of my contacts and business relationships are opposed to you in any way, shape and form regulating the Internet. We are not interested in you asserting your set of values, beliefs and agendas over yet another free form of information exchange and commerce. Federal regulators and non-elected bureaucrats were never supposed to control and regulate communication and information exchange. Nowhere in the US Constitution are they given any authority to control or regulate free speech, free enterprise or free information exchange. In fact, it actually sets forth prohibitions against this. Freedom is the choice of making good or bad decisions, it's messy. It's not supposed to be controlled or molded by our government or its unelected regulators. Small to large businesses are already suffering and a competitive disadvantage to their international counter parts, because of Washington's insatiable desire to control and regulate everything. Our free enterprise system is continuing to diminish and Socialism is becoming the form of government and economic system which encumbers and defines us.

I oppose the attempt of the FCC and the Obama Administration to regulate the internet and free speech, for the pure and simple reason that they can't control the opposition to their policies and politics. Regulation of the internet will mean the media and the government will no longer have any truly free opinion exchange of an opposing nature. It will hurt American business making us less competitive than we are already. It will hurt and stifle American citizens who disagree with current party or administration in control, regardless of which party it happens to be. Finally it will hurt America by continuing to regulate and restrain free speech and making us less free and less the America we once were.

Fulton Sheen

Cynthia Shelley  
January 13, 2010, 8:24 am  
35556 County Road 57  
Gill, Colorado 80624

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. This is obviously what you want.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such risks would keep investors at bay.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Joel Shellman  
January 13, 2010, 8:38 am  
1324 SE 283rd Ave  
Camas, Washington 98607

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility would be disastrous to the freedom of people everywhere.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the competitive Internet has become.

Anyone proposing regulation on the Internet does so out of ignorance or malice.

Cari Sherrod  
January 13, 2010, 8:41 am  
1 Winster Fax  
Williamsburg, Virginia 23185

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I URGE YOU TO THINK FOR YOURSELVES, NOT YOUR WALLET. USE YOUR GOD-GIVEN CONSCIENCE WHEN MAKING DECISIONS "FOR ME". YOU HAVE NO RIGHT TO DO WHAT YOU'VE ALREADY DONE, AND WHAT YOU'RE STILL DOING. YOU WON'T BE "IN POWER" FOREVER, SO I WOULD WATCH WHAT YOU DO VERY CAREFULLY; YOU WILL BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR EVERY SINGLE THING YOU DO.

Douglas Sherwin  
January 13, 2010, 8:49 am  
15102 Kestrelrise Drive  
Lithia, Florida 33547

As an concerned citizen and member of Americans for Prosperity, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Clancy Shipley  
January 13, 2010, 8:57 am  
1174 splashing brook drive  
abingdon, Maryland 21009

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

So keep your dirty hands off of the internet and out of the peoples pockets. Period.

David Shipp  
January 13, 2010, 9:14 am  
1589 Brookside Camp Rd  
Hendersonville, North Carolina 28792

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. We need less Government, NOT MORE!

Linda Shirk  
January 13, 2010, 9:19 am  
9 Timberlake Road  
Bloomington, Illinois 61704

Government should leave the private sector alone and let capitalism work with efficiency. Private ownership will make needed changes as the market dictates. This is far better than the opinion of a few dictating what everyone else should do. Keep the internet free and open!

Stephen Shirk  
January 13, 2010, 9:20 am  
1737 Azalea Dr  
Lawrenceville, Georgia 30043

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Furthermore, as a network professional for more than 30 years, I fully understand the implications of removing prioritization from the routers, servers, and other intelligent devices providing orderly traffic to reach its destination. If the FCC passes this legislation, you will hamstring providers, kill millions of jobs in the network infrastructure profession, and create one more grab for control of the private sector. I resent your effort and will do everything in my power to see you not only defeated, but unmasked for the deceit you perpetuate on the citizens of our country!

Steve Shirk

Donna Shively  
January 13, 2010, 9:22 am  
253 Hilltop  
Goldonna, Louisiana 71031

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I fell very strongly that any attempt to regulate content, or prioritization of the internet is a direct and blatant violation of my freedom of speech, which is protected under the First Amendment of the Constitution.

It is also my belief that government ownership or control of the internet will be the next feeding frenzy for powerful lobby groups.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Shively  
07 Jan, 2010



Randi Shober  
January 13, 2010, 9:34 am  
509 Holtzman Rd  
Reinholds, Pennsylvania 17569

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I agree with the members of Americans for Prosperity.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Robert Short  
January 13, 2010, 9:34 am  
1850 Lake Terrace Drive  
Eustis, Florida 32726

As a former Director, Information Services, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (1987-94), and the person who introduced use of the Internet to penetrate Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, I enabled the ability of millions behind the Iron Curtain to acquire truthful information.

Second, as an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

julie shoup  
January 13, 2010, 9:35 am  
4411 forest drive  
everett, Washington 98203

It's time to rein in the government and the power mongers running it!!!!!!!!!!!!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Michael Shrader  
January 13, 2010, 9:36 am  
18095 via del Colorete  
Sahuarita, Arizona 85629

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I do not want our government or any other government involved in our daily lives including healthcare.

Richard Shuker  
January 13, 2010, 9:41 am  
409 Pennsylvania Ave  
Shillington, Pennsylvania 19607

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The duty of government is to leave commerce to its own capital and credit as well as all other branches of business, protecting all in their legal pursuits, granting exclusive privileges to none.  
Andrew Jackson

Kate Sigler  
January 13, 2010, 9:44 am  
69 Zander Dr.  
Chillicothe, Ohio 45601

Regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

rich silva  
January 13, 2010, 9:47 am  
p.o. box 4801  
santa fe, New Mexico 87502

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Roger Simister  
January 13, 2010, 9:50 am  
2874 S. Old Highway 91  
New Harmony, Utah 84757

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am totally against “net neutrality”.

This could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Donald Simmons  
January 13, 2010, 9:55 am  
3117 Branding Iron Way  
Berthoud, Colorado 80513

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. \*\*\*\*\*

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government.

\*\*\*\* The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. \*\*\*\*

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

MY POINT IS : In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Tom Simmons  
January 13, 2010, 10:04 am  
758 Crestview Loop  
Crossville, Tennessee 38571

As an American citizen and Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I heartily concur with the above statement and feel that further action by the FCC concerning this matter is unwarranted, unnecessary and as it pertains to areas of the proposal specified above is beyond the scope of the FCC.

Reid Simpson  
January 13, 2010, 10:32 am  
20002 207th ST CT. E  
Orting, Washington 98360

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

For any and all reasons, the government needs to keep it's nose out of the internet.

Thank you

Ernest Sinclair  
January 13, 2010, 10:32 am  
16502 Denise Dr.  
Austin, Texas 78717-3049

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The administration and Congress cannot on the one hand condemn restrictions of Internet use in foreign countries and on the other hand seek to govern/regulate use of the Internet in the United States.

Tracey Singleton  
January 13, 2010, 10:33 am  
1501 Pinewood Court  
Bel Air, Maryland 21014

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Stan Siranovich  
January 13, 2010, 10:36 am  
2078 Shady Grove Way  
Louisville, Kentucky 40218

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

YOU PEOPLE ARE MORONS. YOU MUST THINK THAT WE ARE AS STUPID AS YOU ARE. BUTT OUT OF THE INTERNET.

Richard Sistrunk  
January 13, 2010, 10:49 am  
2210 Southern Road  
Sanford, North Carolina 27330

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In summary...the government should leave the internet alone. Just look at all the other government run institutions that are broke already and have been for years... The US Post Office, Social Security, Fannie Mae, War On Poverty, Medicare and Medicaid, Freddie Mac, Cash for Clunkers...all a 100% failure rate

David & Lynne Sity  
January 13, 2010, 10:57 am  
1785 E. Cottage Ave.  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55119

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Attempts to control free speech and communication in the United States are both Fascist and Communist.



Robert Sizemore  
January 13, 2010, 11:02 am  
7812 Melcombe Way  
Wake Forest, North Carolina 27587

As an American for Prosperity supporter, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jim Skoczlas  
January 13, 2010, 11:18 am  
520 Cherryhill Dr.  
Bridgeville, Pennsylvania 15017

Leave the internet alone. Let the free market determine how to operate and run the network.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Anne Skorupski  
January 13, 2010, 11:28 am  
47 Braeburn Rd  
Bristol, Connecticut 6010

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

**KEEP YOUR HANDS OFF!**

David Skrzypczak  
January 13, 2010, 11:37 am  
10341 Wildwood  
Interlochen, Michigan 49643

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52: The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense. The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney. Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Hans Slade  
January 13, 2010, 11:43 am  
810 Cypress Drive  
Rio Vista, California 94571

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Everything government regulates suffers from unintelligent and uncaring oversight that adds cost and slows innovation. The Net is conversation between citizens, the government has no right to listen in or regulate that intercourse.

Jan Slama  
January 13, 2010, 11:43 am  
12422 E. Mansfield Ave, #79  
Spokane Valley, Washington 99216

Absolutely NO Government Control of the Internet! Not even indirectly.

The internet is a thousand, a hundred thousand times more beneficial to all the world as a resource and information provider than any detriment which might come from terrorists or evil doers!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

ROBERT SLAPE  
January 13, 2010, 11:52 am  
6402 ALPINE  
AMARILLO, Texas 79109

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Continued expansion of government into the lives of American citizens designed to control our very thoughts and existence is anti-American and unconstitutional. Put your efforts into something worthwhile such as reducing the size of government!!!

Miranda Slone  
January 13, 2010, 11:54 am  
952 Arkansas Creek Rd.  
Martin, Kentucky 41649

To put it plainly, if it isn't broke, don't fix it. The Internet has flourished in private sector hands; if that changes, Congress can decide what to do about it. At the moment, "net neutrality" is entirely unnecessary.



bec small  
January 13, 2010, 11:57 am  
box 21291  
sedona, Arizona 86341

Stop the expansion of government and it's intrusion into our lives!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Harry Smallwood  
January 13, 2010, 12:04 pm  
1176 Cliffrose Way  
1176 Cliffrose Way  
Beaumont,, California 92223

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The citizens of the United States of America do not need, or want, more government control over our free enterprise system. Keep your hands off by not passing new laws that will prohibit the free expression offered by the internet as it now exists.  
Harry Smallwood — A concerned citizen.

Brittany Smith  
January 13, 2010, 12:08 pm  
781 S. 1100 E  
Pleasant Grove, Utah 84062

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Curtis Smith  
January 13, 2010, 12:13 pm  
6434 Colonial Village Loop  
Manassas, Virginia 20112

I agree with the comments provided below from Americans for Prosperity, but also wanted to add my statement.

This "Open Internet" concept which promotes, "Together we can preserve a 'free' and 'open' Internet to promote greater innovation, job creation, and a more connected America" will do nothing more than stagnate free speech and competition on the web. Don't ruin a good thing by allowing government regulations (of any kind) to deter companies and individuals from enjoying an already "free" and "open" Internet. I can guarantee, companies and individuals, like myself, will stop using the Internet. You will drive away competition, therefore companies and the people they employ, and an otherwise "booming" Internet community that was already innovative (and growing).

Furthermore, I support the following:

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James Smith  
January 13, 2010, 12:24 pm  
jimsmith@@rockisland.com  
Friday Harbor, Washington 98250

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply NO rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Kay Smith  
January 13, 2010, 12:25 pm  
1419 N. Denver Ct.  
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74075

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

Laurence Smith  
January 13, 2010, 12:30 pm  
56099 River Shore Lane  
Elkhart, Indiana 46516

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please keep Governmental hands and regulations off the internet!

Leonard Smith  
January 13, 2010, 12:33 pm  
4851 Auburn Ford  
Greenwood, Indiana 46142

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Leave the internet alone!



Mark Smith  
January 13, 2010, 12:36 pm  
123 S. Eastwood Drive, Suite 5204-149  
Woodstock, Illinois 60098

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

TERESA SMITH  
January 13, 2010, 12:39 pm  
2473 SW. BAYSHORE BLVD.  
PORT SAINT LUCIE, Florida 34984

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

WHO DO YOU THINK YOU ARE? IF YOU DON'T LIKE AMERICA LEAVE AMERICANS LOVE AMERICA FREE, FREE AND WE WILL STAY THAT WAY, WASHINGTON HAS WOKE UP PEOPLE WHO NEVER SPOKE BEFORE, GET OUT OF OUR WAY. you will not get over on us. we win in the end because we are freeeeeeee.

Zach Smith  
January 13, 2010, 12:40 pm  
600 S. Park St  
Pocahontas, Arkansas 72455

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Charles Smith MD  
January 13, 2010, 12:41 pm  
3112 Maryland Rd.  
Rockford, Illinois 61108

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn and inventive development would dry up.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. Do not sneak around the people of this country; give representative process its due.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

G. Mick Smith, PhD  
January 13, 2010, 12:44 pm  
4 Kevin Way  
Malvern, Pennsylvania 19355

As a registered Democrat who has worked with technology and the Internet for years, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank you,  
Dr. G. Mick Smith

Stephen Snitz  
January 13, 2010, 12:48 pm  
4310 W. 70th Terrace  
Prairie Village, Kansas 66208

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive and such competition keeps companies honest in its internet services. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers and go out of business. If the government exercised control over the Internet, and its actions were malicious in blocking or censoring specific Internet traffic, there would be no place to turn for recourse.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense. The net effect would be to drive out for profit competition, exactly what is needed to keep companies honest.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that must be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission must not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. The legality of attempts to do so will surely be challenged.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior (if they have it let's have it presented in open forum), there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Rick Snow  
January 13, 2010, 12:49 pm  
2893 Larkin Avenue  
Clovis, California 93612

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Gloria Snyder  
January 13, 2010, 12:52 pm  
2899 Daniel Drive  
Sinking Spring, Pennsylvania 19608

Remember: You work for the American people!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Mary Snyder  
January 13, 2010, 12:56 pm  
1001 W. Lambert Rd. #153  
La Habra, California 90631

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Robert Snyder  
January 13, 2010, 12:57 pm  
4271 Chittingham Drive  
Pace, Florida 32571

America was founded on Christian principles and the free enterprise concept of capitalism with minimal government intervention and control.

All that is being challenged today and we should oppose it and expect our duly elected representatives in Washington to defeat any proposed law that violates these founding principles. Prayer should be encouraged in our schools and attempts by the ACLU to do otherwise should be slammed down quickly. The American flag should be given the respect it should have. Government control of business should be kept at a very minimum to protect American lives and well being. The use of the Internet should be privately owned and competitively run. The government should not impose its control under any disguise such as Open Internet.

Lawmakers who do not support the ideas and principles of the Founding Fathers should be voted out of office. Give us back the America as it used to be.

Nancy Solano  
January 13, 2010, 12:58 pm  
PO Box 41641  
Mesa, Arizona 85274

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

KATHY Solvig  
January 13, 2010, 1:00 pm  
201Northside  
Lexington, North Carolina 27292

To put the following simply: Let us keep freedom of speech and freedom of internet use!!!!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sam Southern  
January 13, 2010, 1:07 pm  
406 Waughtown St.  
Winston Salem, North Carolina 27127

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Sam Southern 336.399.7252

Leo Spaeder  
January 13, 2010, 1:07 pm  
425 Pacific Avenue  
Forest Hills, Pennsylvania 15221-4011

Government --- leave the Internet alone.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Steve Spafford  
January 13, 2010, 1:12 pm  
5107 N. Aberdeen Pl.  
Meridian, Idaho 83646

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This is simply one more example of how our communist leadership is grabbing control. If they can limit discussion and communication, they control the debate and win.

Julie Spanarelli  
January 13, 2010, 1:12 pm  
413 Hawkins Rd  
Selden, New York 11784

You are exercising right not given to you my OUR CONSTITUTION!!! Freedom of expresion is a guaranteed right!  
If you don't like our constitution, move out of the USA!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Donald Spear  
January 13, 2010, 1:14 pm  
4242 E. 5th Street  
Tucson, Arizona 85711

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In conclusion, the internet works because it is free of government regulation. Let it be.

Sincerely,  
Don Spear

Sue Speck  
January 13, 2010, 1:25 pm  
10 Augusta Dr #1  
Vernon, New Jersey 7462

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Your bald attempt to control the Internet in hopes of shutting off Conservative dissent is as pathetic as the rest of the Marxist initiatives being forced down our throats.

It is obvious that the real agenda of the gang of political malefactors currently in power is nothing less than the destruction of America. A pox on all of you: hands off our Internet, and be prepared to start job-hunting after the next two elections. We are taking our country back!

Sue/Igor Speck/Jaworowsky  
January 13, 2010, 1:33 pm  
10 Augusta Dr #1  
Vernon, New Jersey 7462

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The only reason you people want to do this is because you can't stand having the light of truth beamed upon your Marxist propaganda. If the web was chock full of support for the socialist BS you keep shoveling out of DC, you wouldn't be saying 'BOO' about internet freedom.

Unfortunately for you, the web hasn't been as sickeningly malleable as the press - all of whom can't suck down to the leftwing idiocy fast or often enough - and hence, we who love our country have become a primary danger to those of you who don't.

Hands off our internet. Move to some socialist paradise in Europe where you belong and leave what remains of our noble Constitution and our beautiful Republic ALONE.

Sue Speck & Igor Jaworowsky

Darryl Speiser  
January 13, 2010, 1:36 pm  
4430 E. Jennifer Dr.  
Nampa, Idaho 83686

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

What the Government regulates it controls. I object to any controls herein proposed.

Shirley Spellerberg  
January 13, 2010, 1:37 pm  
3621 Lynchburg Drive  
Denton, Texas 76208

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership.

The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dale Spencer  
January 13, 2010, 1:37 pm  
5771 McPhersons Pt  
Livonia, New York 144879212

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.  
**GET OUT OF OUR LIVES !**

Stewart Dale Spencer  
January 13, 2010, 1:37 pm  
1290 Morningwood Drive  
San Marcos, Texas 78666

I am opposed to any new regulatory or legislative control over the Internet. I prefer to let the the market decide how Internet services are delivered to the public.

I repeat, I am opposed to any new regulatory or legislative control over the Internet. I see any such attempts as a threat to our rights to free speech and freedom of the press.

Janice Spetz  
January 13, 2010, 1:40 pm  
3059 Ramona Avenu  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45211

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am completely and unequivocally against any attempt by the FCC or other government agency to turn the internet into a "public utility" of sorts. I do not want to see government ownership or control of the internet.



Roxie Spina  
January 13, 2010, 1:44 pm  
9 Barkman Way  
Chester, New Jersey 7930

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Patty Spitzmiller  
January 13, 2010, 1:47 pm  
3667 C R 222  
Cape Girardeau, Missouri 63701

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Just leave it to the private sector. "It ain't broke..don't fit it."

Charles Sproull  
January 13, 2010, 1:49 pm  
PO Box 74  
Springville, Indiana 47462

For mature (honest and unselfish) people, free speech does not need to be regulated. Only immature (selfish and dishonest) people need regulations.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

F Spucci  
January 13, 2010, 1:53 pm  
456 Pelhamdale Avenue  
Pelham, New York 10803

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Simply stated: "Don't mess with the internet" It is fine and certainly competitive.

William Spurlock  
January 13, 2010, 1:53 pm  
336 Wells Fork Road  
Viper, Kentucky 41774

Hands Off!!!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Doug Squeo  
January 13, 2010, 1:55 pm  
1989 Wexford Circle  
Wheaton, Illinois 60189

As an Americans for Prosperity supporter, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Roger Stadnik  
January 13, 2010, 1:55 pm  
Pinetown Road  
Audubon, Pennsylvania 19403

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This proposal appears to me to be a "solution" in search of a problem. Ask yourself what it is that the proponents of this/these regulations are really up to.

Dan Stahl  
January 13, 2010, 1:59 pm  
1401 N 7th Street  
Ponca City, Oklahoma 74601

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Ova Stambush  
January 13, 2010, 2:03 pm  
2425 Heard Street  
Evansville, Indiana 47725

Keep the federal government out of our personal lives.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Heather Stancil  
January 13, 2010, 2:06 pm  
525 NW 3rd St  
Earlham, Iowa 50072

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I have been in the telecom & internet industry for years, and have personally experienced the benefit of competition: lower prices and better service. Where, pray tell my dear Chicken Littles, is the problem exactly?

Charles E Stanfield  
January 13, 2010, 2:07 pm  
12617 w 121st St  
Overland Park, Kansas 66213

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I personally think we need to keep the Government out of more things and let private business compete. Government needs to do less, just protect our country.

Thomas Stark  
January 13, 2010, 2:07 pm  
334 Seven Acres Road  
Parkersburg, West Virginia 26104

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The government's role in communications issues should be one of minimally intrusive, common sense, rules that allow all competing interests equal access and a level playing field. How successfully each of those competitors operates on that level playing field should be market-driven. If what they are doing is not in the best interest of a consumer, they will have alternative means to accomplish their task or need and the abuser will be flushed from the market through free choice, not government manipulation.

Vladimir Starkov  
January 13, 2010, 2:14 pm  
1846 Sheffield Lane  
Geneva, Illinois 60134

As a concerned American citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

As an economist who does, among other, some consulting work for the telecommunication industry, I believe that the Internet at present is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Franklin Starks  
January 13, 2010, 2:16 pm  
PO Box 306  
1287 Highway 53  
Zuni, New Mexico 87327

Please don't meddle in the content of the internet. I won't bother to point out the devastating effect it will have on our freedoms as government takes more control of our lives; you are already fully aware of that. If you proceed, it will because you hope to effect that devastation.

Your action will answer the question.

John Stasnek  
January 13, 2010, 2:21 pm  
P.O. Box 63345  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19114

As a concerned citizen and internet user, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense. This could well become another case of government interference in lawful commerce.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jeff Stasney  
January 13, 2010, 2:21 pm  
111 PR 7284  
De Berry, Texas 75639-2343

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

More government control is not the answer.  
In this venue or any free market venue.  
The government will kill the internet as we know it if  
the GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52 is allowed.

Respectfully,

Jeff and Judy Stasney



Stan Stearns  
January 13, 2010, 2:22 pm  
11918 s. 53rd st  
Papillion, Nebraska 68133

I don't want the Government controlling the internet. I don't want a so called Open Internet. It is OPEN now. It will be closed and cost the taxpayers and Americans billions of dollars for another thing the government controls but wastes our money and productivity. What happen to open markets and freedom? I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Brenda D Steed  
January 13, 2010, 2:22 pm  
1425 2nd ave. sp. 182  
Chula Vista, California 91911

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

KEEP AWAY FROM THE INTERNET YOU HAVE NO RIGHT TO DO THIS

brenda d steed  
January 13, 2010, 2:26 pm  
1425 2nd ave.  
chula vista, California 91911

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

NO GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION PLEASE

Paul Stein  
January 13, 2010, 2:28 pm  
172 Oenoke Lane  
New Canaan, Connecticut 6840

I submit the following comment regarding preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The internet strikes me as so complex, and our present government so responsive to small groups of activists and special interests that are often uninformed and/or unknowing of the technical requirements of the internet that passing this legislation will set up conditions for major problems. There will be so many mistakes made because of the political strength of unknowing congressmen and others and so many unintended adverse consequences that we shall suffer mightily.

George Stephens  
January 13, 2010, 2:29 pm  
761-201 Bishops Park Drive  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27605

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Peggy Stephens  
January 13, 2010, 2:30 pm  
8780 Mt. Washington Road  
Taylorsville, Kentucky 40071

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

LEAVE MY INTERNET ALONE!

keneth stevens  
January 13, 2010, 2:34 pm  
234 ridgefield ave  
bogota, New Jersey 7603

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Patricia Stevens  
January 13, 2010, 2:36 pm  
1416 West 6th Street  
North Platte, Nebraska 69101

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please stop now!



William Stevens  
January 13, 2010, 2:37 pm  
3385 Wheeling Road  
Lancaster, Ohio 43130

As an Americans for Prosperity tax payer, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Don Stevenson  
January 13, 2010, 2:40 pm  
9692 Westheimer  
Houston, Texas 77063

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jesse Stewart  
January 13, 2010, 2:41 pm  
102 Caravel Ct  
Havelock, North Carolina 28532

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In simple English the Government needs to keep it's thieving hands off.

Laine Stewart  
January 13, 2010, 2:41 pm  
10300 Butternut Circle  
Massas, Virginia 20110

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52: DO NOT MESS WITH THE CONSTITUTION OR THE BILL OF RIGHTS ! OUR FREEDOM IS GUARANTEED!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Robert Stewart  
January 13, 2010, 2:44 pm  
200 North Main st.  
Russell, Pennsylvania 16345

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. Hands off our freedom and liberty that has made this the greatest country on earth. Don't Tread On Me!

Beulah Stidham  
January 13, 2010, 2:44 pm  
1218 11th Street  
Hermosa Beach, California 90254

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

**DO NOT TAKE OVER THE INTERNET!**

Joan Stirlen  
January 13, 2010, 2:49 pm  
2208 Scissortail Lane  
Edmond, Oklahoma 73034

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. It is in total disregard of the principles of freedom established in our constitution.

Thank you  
Joan Stirlen

Robert and Barbara Stokes  
January 13, 2010, 2:55 pm  
3779 Highway 77 N., Marion, AR  
Marion, Arkansas 72364

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Bob and Barbara Stokes



Catherine Stone  
January 13, 2010, 2:56 pm  
133 McGinnis Rd  
Scottsville, New York 14546

As an American I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet, GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52 as presented by Americans for Prosperity. The FCC is overstepping its bounds by acting without congressional approval on a matter that will ultimately affect the constitutional free speech rights of all Americans.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Glynn Stone  
January 13, 2010, 2:59 pm  
P.O. Box 1785  
Grants Pass, Oregon 97528

Please help stop "Open Internet". We don't need government regulating an already free and working system.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Bill Stork  
January 13, 2010, 3:00 pm  
P.O. Box 19906  
Greensboro, North Carolina 27410

I agree with the statements below...

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Pat Strati  
January 13, 2010, 3:02 pm  
300 Westminster Canterbury Dr.  
Apt 529  
Winchester, Virginia 22603

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I am against the internet being controlled by the gov't.  
That takes away our freedoms. pat Strati

Wilton Stribling  
January 13, 2010, 3:06 pm  
3909 Mt Hayden Dr  
Montrose, Colorado 81403

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Shannon Strickland  
January 13, 2010, 3:07 pm  
20 Bramlett Road  
Taylors, South Carolina 29687

I will submit the official response below, but first my personal response:

As a private citizen and as a professional I will tell you now, I will NEVER accept government control of the free enterprise known as the internet. This dangerous path to socialism will not be accepted by me or any other true American - EVER! You need to back off of this ridiculous nonsense right now. Knowing the technical requirements to create and maintain such complex networks myself, it is quite obvious to me that the morons who thought this ill conceived idea up have absolutely no clue in how things work. Not to mention the governments great legacy of "achievements" when it puts it's nose where it does not belong. Enough - drop this BS right now.

NOW THE OFFICIAL COMMENT:

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Stephen Struk  
January 13, 2010, 3:08 pm  
73 Harding Road  
Wyckoff, New Jersey 7481

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In a nutshell, keep the government away from regulating legitimate Internet usage and models.

Carolyn Strutner  
January 13, 2010, 3:11 pm  
1425 Beechlake Drive  
Columbus, Ohio 43235

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Stop government taking over everything in our lives..



Sarah H. Studstill  
January 13, 2010, 3:17 pm  
2793 Woodland Park Drive  
Atlanta, Georgia 30345-4033

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

A long time user of email, the Internet,  
Sarah H. Studstill

Fred Stuhlmiller  
January 13, 2010, 3:17 pm  
500 N. Lake Havasu Ave. C-106  
Lake Havasu City, Arizona 86403

Read this and stop the madness.

#### 1ST. AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

Congress shall make (no law) respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; (or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press;) or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

#### 9TH. AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.

Legalize the CONSTITUTION and let Americans live in FREEDOM and the RIGHT to the pursuit of happiness.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Andrew Sullivan  
January 13, 2010, 3:21 pm  
7748 Western Ave  
Omaha, Nebraska 68114

As a friend of Americans for Prosperity , I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Call it "net neutrality" or "open internet", it is not a good idea. We get more choices and lower prices when we let the market work.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ann Sullivan  
January 13, 2010, 3:24 pm  
103 Wildwood Drive  
Goldsboro, North Carolina 27530

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comments regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

First of all let me say, You people in Washington are just not getting the message to stop meddling in our lives..Stop it! Free people should have the right to choose free speech. The internet falls under Freedom of Speech.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Charles Sullivan  
January 13, 2010, 3:26 pm  
97 Old Brunswick Rd  
Gardiner, Maine 4345

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

terrence sullivan  
January 13, 2010, 3:28 pm  
5446 jarman st  
colorado springs, Colorado 80906

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The men in this group are behaving badly and violating several amendments in our Constitution  
Terry Sullivan

Bob Sundquist  
January 13, 2010, 3:30 pm  
28466 Old KC Road  
Paola, Kansas 66071

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be rescued with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jennifer Suter  
January 13, 2010, 3:31 pm  
6992 Saratoga Ct.  
Summerfield, North Carolina 27358

Keep the internet private, not a public entity.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Charles sutherland  
January 13, 2010, 3:33 pm  
2204 Pasadena St  
Santa Ana, California 92705

As an Americans for Prosperity, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Rebekah Sutherland  
January 13, 2010, 3:35 pm  
1121 West Avenue J-11  
Lancaster, California 93534-4807

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Washington must not be allowed to control the Internet where we, Americans, enjoy the freedom of speech and freedom of press, with one another.

David Sutton  
January 13, 2010, 3:44 pm  
89 San Bonita Way  
Havana, Florida 32333

As an American Patriot who's discussed with the government's blatant attempts to control our lives and abolish our constitutional freedoms, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

It does not surprise me that liberal government bureaucrats want to control the Internet like they attempt to control all aspects of citizens lives. 'Open Internet' or 'net neutrality' is just liberal double speak to disguise your true intent of control of information channels.

Every thing I've seen the government control, I've seen ruined. The government does nothing well. Do not try to extent government control to the Internet. Keep your hands off the people's only government-free means of communications.

Julie Sutton  
January 13, 2010, 3:44 pm  
14121 Rorring Rd  
Winfield, Kansas 67156

The internet is a beautiful example of FREEDOM, which is the priceless attribute setting the United States apart from most of the rest of the world. Please do not restrict our liberty by allowing the federal government to have control over the internet! Honor the Constitution and the Bill of Rights that protects freedom of speech and freedom of the press.

Kevin Sweeney  
January 13, 2010, 3:51 pm  
18 Oakville Drive  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15220

As an Americans, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

In my own town I can choose between Comcast and Verizon with each company offering better deals to get my business.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney. This might lead us to what is happening in China - which I oppose.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Anne Swift-Jones  
January 13, 2010, 4:04 pm  
12607 Westlodge Court  
Herndon, Virginia 20170

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility IS A MAJOR POLICY CHANGE THAT SHOULDN'T BE DEBATED IN CONGRESS, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James Sykes  
January 13, 2010, 4:05 pm  
101 Lincolnshire Drive  
Crossville,, Tennessee 38555

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

William Toby Sykes  
January 13, 2010, 4:08 pm  
5453 Foxwood Drive  
Riegelwood, North Carolina 28456

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank you, Toby Sykes



Mr. and Mrs. Michael Sykora  
January 13, 2010, 4:21 pm  
11 W. 79th St.  
Kansas City, Missouri 64114

Please! for your own sake and your organization, have a great relationship with God just by praying for one! That's all that needs to be done to get it started! That way, problems like these mentioned below, will not be happening so much, possibly stopping altogether!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Suzanne Tait  
January 13, 2010, 4:22 pm  
3811 W Schafer Rd  
Pinckney, Michigan 48169

WHAT IS IT THAT WE HAVE FOUGHT FOR/ GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF THE INTERNET IS WRONG. WE ARE NOT CHINA NOR A COMMUNIST COUNTRY. SAOROSA!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

nick takacs  
January 13, 2010, 4:24 pm  
po box 6023  
avon, Colorado 81620

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

M Talamo  
January 13, 2010, 4:24 pm  
444 Commercial Ave  
Cliffside park, New Jersey 7010

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

**KEEP YOUR HANDS OFF OUR LIBERTIES and FREEDOM!**

ELLEN TALIERCIO  
January 13, 2010, 4:27 pm  
84 BARTON AVENUE  
STATEN ISLAND, New York 10306

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I watch what is taking place in Iran and notice a grave similarity to what you wish to do. Control the media - including the internet in order to censor what people are allowed to hear. To promote liberal points of view and try to change our country into a close version of France. Think of yourself as an American first and you have to realize how wrong your thinking is. We are a great country and will only continue to succeed if we retain our freedom.

I, and I now realize, many other Americans are not willing to allow the take over of our lives by a government running out of control with power.

Transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress not decided by a Commission.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

If you continue along the path that you are chosen you will lose the faith of taxpaying Americans and you should prepare yourselves for what will happen at that point in time.

Al Tallant  
January 13, 2010, 4:31 pm  
700 Leisure dr  
Fort Worth, Texas 76120

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We want the freedom and rights afforded us by our constitution and Bill of Rights-namely freedom of speech. We are not a Marxist nor communist country !!

Warren Tanner  
January 13, 2010, 4:35 pm  
786 Landing Road  
North Pole, Alaska 99705

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Lois Tannous  
January 13, 2010, 4:35 pm  
26 Beechwood Dr  
Wayne, New Jersey 7470

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Walt Taufen  
January 13, 2010, 4:37 pm  
707 B Warner Ave  
Lewiston, Idaho 83501

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Barbara Taylor  
January 13, 2010, 4:39 pm  
2 River Bend Circle  
Exeter, New Hampshire 3833

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

If it isn't enough, we should only look at the so-called "freedom" that the protesters in Tehran have. It's a great example of an "open internet". Open to whom and for what REAL cause?

Barbara E. Taylor

David Taylor  
January 13, 2010, 4:42 pm  
3601 E Stagecoach Dr  
Kingman, Arizona 86401

I am a retired network engineer with a great deal of Internet experience. I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jackie Taylor  
January 13, 2010, 4:46 pm  
2701 Raven Drive  
Sierra Vista, Arizona 85650

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Hands off!!!!

Jackie Taylor  
January 13, 2010, 4:48 pm  
2701 Raven Drive  
Sierra Vista, Arizona 85650

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Hands Off!!!!!!

Jay Taylor  
January 13, 2010, 4:52 pm  
7107 Talnuck Court  
Clarkston, Michigan 48348

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. This must not occur.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

JOHN TAYLOR  
January 13, 2010, 4:57 pm  
101 CAROL COURT  
FOREST, Virginia 24551

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. If this socialism effort does not stop, We will vote all incumbents out of office the next election and therefore give you folks exactly what you deserve. TERM LIMITS!

Charlene Tebar  
January 13, 2010, 5:02 pm  
747 Parkman Ave.  
Los Angeles, California 90026

Please be advised, that this statement and the data that it contains inform me that the Commission is way outside its bounds in moving forward along this line and needs to be reigned in.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I endorse the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



A. Teixeira  
January 13, 2010, 5:05 pm  
4757 E Quailbrush Rd  
Cave Creek, Arizona 85331

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Duncan Tenney  
January 13, 2010, 5:08 pm  
26 West Cheyenne Mtn. Blvd.  
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80906

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

WHY ARE YOU DOING THIS???!!!?? (trying to regulate the internet)

Duncan Tenney

Claudia Tennyson  
January 13, 2010, 5:12 pm  
4 Nickel Mine Dr.  
Seymour, Connecticut 6483

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I don't need another government run business!! Stay out of business! Is this America or France!!

Frank Terry  
January 13, 2010, 5:23 pm  
500 W Santa Maria Street, Space 22  
Santa Paula, California 93060

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Wilfred E Tessier Jr  
January 13, 2010, 5:29 pm  
6726 Galley Rd  
CDolorado Springd, Colorado 80915

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. For the government to even contemplate trying to control free access to the internet is a direct assault on freedom of speech and put said government in the same league as the people's republic of china. No amount of rationalization can put a good face on such an outrageous proposal! The attempt to become a controlling presence in all areas of ordinary life is not in keeping with concept and content of the Constitution.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Barbara Thoman  
January 13, 2010, 5:32 pm  
6618 Wilderness Trail  
Fishers, Indiana 46038

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

We do not want the FCC to interfere with the Internet. Heavy handed regulation forcing us to have no privacy lessens our freedom even more than the federal government has all ready.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dorothy Thomas  
January 13, 2010, 5:32 pm  
37 Belmar Blvd.  
Waretown, New Jersey 8758

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Harry Thomas  
January 13, 2010, 5:33 pm  
P.O. Box 24159  
San Jose, California 95154

Messing with the Internet will get you thrown out of office or at least unelectable.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



John Thomas  
January 13, 2010, 5:42 pm  
13061 Hanlon Rd.  
Albion, New York 14411

As an American citizen. I reject government interference in our use of the internet. Your positions as leaders of this nation is not to subject us to your flagrant abuse of your power. The internet is NOT a government concern. You did not invent it and you will not control it.

John Thomas

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Marc Thomas  
January 13, 2010, 5:50 pm  
156 Lake Holiday Road  
Cross Junction, Virginia 22625

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Patricia Thomas  
January 13, 2010, 5:50 pm  
884 Todd Lane  
Arroyo Grande, California 93420

Keep your fucking hands off of the interest!! You're just a bunch of muslim nazis. Keep your propaganda to your acorn whores.

Steve Thomas  
January 13, 2010, 6:00 pm  
4099 Benden Circle  
Murrysville, Pennsylvania 15668

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thomas O. Thomas  
January 13, 2010, 6:02 pm  
8510 E. Alluvial  
Clovis, California 93619

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

.Under no circumstances should the internet be regulated in any matter. Freedom of the Press is essentially what we have on the Internet, though on a smaller scale. I advise Government to go easy on tampering with American's rights as the mood I hear in my circles is of the coming 2nd revolution. The talk is peaceful now, but a year ago there wasn't even a whisper to be heard. Read the Constitution, and act accordingly.

Thomas O. Thomas  
January 13, 2010, 6:05 pm  
8510 E. Alluvial  
Clovis, California 93619

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

.Under no circumstances should the internet be regulated in any matter. Freedom of the Press is essentially what we have on the Internet, though on a smaller scale. I advise Government to go easy on tampering with American's rights as the mood I hear in my circles is of the coming 2nd revolution. The talk is peaceful now, but a year ago there wasn't even a whisper to be heard. Read the Constitution, and act accordingly.

Stephen Thomason  
January 13, 2010, 6:07 pm  
4712 Chaparral Run  
Enid, Oklahoma 73703

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

What you are trying to do is ultimately silent dissent and control all media outlets as dictators such as Hugo Chavez do, and as the Soviets did. No more trampling on our constitution.

Julianne Thompson  
January 13, 2010, 6:11 pm  
Box 204  
Grand Island, New York 14072

Private industry is the economic engine that runs a stable economy. Government controlled internet is unconstitutional at its core and will surely be met with intense and highly expensive legal opposition. The final outcome of course, is a definitive loss for the FCC.



Sherry Thompson  
January 13, 2010, 6:11 pm  
420 Old Farms Rd  
Wilkesboro, North Carolina 28697

Do not take away the true open Internet! As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Daniel Thorsen  
January 13, 2010, 6:15 pm  
PO Box 1264  
Prior Lake, Minnesota 55372

I am submitting this to preserve a free from Government control and open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Agnes and Leonard Tillerson  
January 13, 2010, 6:18 pm  
6014 Fossilwood Ct.  
Erie, Pennsylvania 16506

As Americans for Prosperity activists, we are submitting the following comments regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should NOT on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

We are especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply NO rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thomas Tipton  
January 13, 2010, 6:18 pm  
14895 North Bank Road  
Roseburg, Oregon 97470

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank You for your attention in this matter

Richard Tod  
January 13, 2010, 6:22 pm  
18350 Blue Heron Dr W  
Northville, Michigan 48168

First off, we want far less government in our lives.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dan Tomaselli  
January 13, 2010, 6:28 pm  
97 West Norwalk Road  
Number 17  
Norwalk, Connecticut 6850

As a free American citizen, I submit the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Brandan` Topham  
January 13, 2010, 6:49 pm  
35133 Sprague River RD  
Sprague River, Oregon 97639

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

-----  
I would add to that the less government is involved in something the better it works. So far I have not heard any complaints with how the internet is working so stay out of it.

Alittle Tothelleft  
January 13, 2010, 6:51 pm  
1600 Pennsylvania Ave.  
Not Washington, District of Columbia 21001

As someone who Is NOT an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am NOT condoning this statemen: regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Charlotte Tournear  
January 13, 2010, 6:56 pm  
2065 College  
Quincy, Illinois 62301

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

There is too much government control for a party in power that has been so critical in the past of others in power who were branded as restricting the people's freedoms. This is especially dangerous as much of this is being done w/out using the proper avenues of good government. Too much and too fast.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Josephine Towell  
January 13, 2010, 7:02 pm  
8725 NE Milton St.  
Portland, Oregon 97220

As an American Freedom loving citizen,I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Shelley Townley  
January 13, 2010, 7:06 pm  
113 Terrence Ct.  
Greer, South Carolina 29650

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In addition, when the Government is allowed to make decisions about content, or to favor who should have priority, FREE SPEECH WILL BE DEAD! NET NEUTRALITY IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND WILL NOT BE ALLOWED TO STAND.

Brian Tremblay  
January 13, 2010, 7:28 pm  
218 Longview Drive  
Smithfield, North Carolina 27577

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

And last but not least, get out of our pocketbooks, our businesses and our lives. Your justifications for this and other freedom-reducing legislation don't hold water, are abhorrent to the concepts of individual liberty and free markets and will ultimately cost consumers more. You were elected to represent your constituents, not rob them of their freedoms as you deliberately and systematically reshape the look and feel of the United States.

Cindy Trent  
January 13, 2010, 7:29 pm  
130 Fisherman Rd.  
Satsuma, Florida 32189

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jim Tribble  
January 13, 2010, 7:53 pm  
5218 Overlea Drive  
Greensboro, North Carolina 27407

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The Internet should remain open and without government restrictions of any kind! Many businesses rely on the Internet to do business. Government involvement and intervention would only serve to further limit the growth of a free market. Please vote to keep government regulations and bureaucrats away from the Internet.

Jim Trimble  
January 13, 2010, 7:58 pm  
720 Whitefoot Lane  
Effingham, South Dakota 29541

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

In short, keep your hands off of the internet.

Allan Trotter  
January 13, 2010, 8:02 pm  
68 Betta View St.  
Jacksonville, Alabama 36265

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

If more capacity is needed, business will supply it in order to make a profit. We need do nothing to stifle the development of the internet.



Matt Trummer  
January 13, 2010, 8:02 pm  
1251 Beacon Hill Drive  
Highlands Ranch, Colorado 80126

Why does the Government have to rule the internet. Because when technology is better than a government ruled "Snail Mail" then they hate it and must tax it. So continue to kill break through technology with corrupt taxation, as you did my father's small family business.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Don Tucker  
January 13, 2010, 8:14 pm  
5491 Taylors Run Dr  
Clemmons, North Carolina 27012-7075

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Keep the Internet free - keep the government out of this arena. Go work on something that is broken.

sally tucker  
January 13, 2010, 8:23 pm  
4591 n lena  
bh, Florida 34465

Preserve the Internet: NO on GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Leave us alone already! Get out of our lives and KEEP OUT OF OUR INTERNET!

Thomas and Susan Tucker  
January 13, 2010, 8:44 pm  
6083 Tara Lane  
Collinsville, Illinois 62234

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Who do you people think you are? I guess you feel that answering that question would be beneath you!

Rebecca Tunis  
January 13, 2010, 8:47 pm  
483 Big Red Ct.  
Sparland, Illinois 61565

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I would also add that I am for LESS GOVERNMENT NOT MORE. I think that your priorities should lie somewhere more important than to take away more of our freedoms.

C. TURNER  
January 13, 2010, 8:53 pm  
4638 NOTTINGHAM DRIVE  
SUITE H  
LAFAYETTE, Indiana 47909

Please don't let them take away any more of our freedom.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Charles. TURNER  
January 13, 2010, 8:54 pm  
4638 NOTTINGHAM DRIVE  
LAFAYETTE, Indiana 47909

Please refrain from taking any more freedom away from the people.

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Nancy Turner  
January 13, 2010, 8:54 pm  
4638 Nottingham Drive  
Lafayette, Indiana 47909

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Teresa Turner  
January 13, 2010, 9:02 pm  
6270 Jones Rd  
College park, Georgia 30349

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

LEAVE THE INTERNET ALONE> THIS IS NOT CHINA NOR IRAN!

C. TURNER,M.D.  
January 13, 2010, 9:14 pm  
3554 PROMENADE PARKWAY  
SUITE H  
LAFAYETTE, Indiana 47909

Please help stop the destruction of our freedoms.

Also, allow me to submit the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ann Ubelis  
January 13, 2010, 9:18 pm  
11 Marsh St  
Beaufort, South Carolina 29907

### Hands Off My Free Speech!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Kathryn Ubl  
January 13, 2010, 9:30 pm  
1610 Keystone Drive  
Albert Lea, Minnesota 56007

As an American librarian, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

This is in open conflict with the United States Constitution.

Leo Udee  
January 13, 2010, 9:31 pm  
81 Yacoub Ln  
Fond du Lac, Wisconsin 54935

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

"Net Neutrality" only describes what will be the Collateral Damage that will be caused by this proposed over reaching control.

Richard Uhlig  
January 13, 2010, 9:31 pm  
3260 Crossings Court #14  
Bonita Springs, Florida 34134

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Bottom line is - KEEP THE GOVERNMENT OUT OF THE BUSINESS OF MANAGING THE INTERNET! Let free enterprise decide what works best, and competition to keep prices in line.

Nathan Ulery  
January 13, 2010, 9:37 pm  
1944 N. Stanton Court  
Arlington Heights, Illinois 60004

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Simply said, private businesses that build private networks to connect to the Internet should be able to make their own decisions regarding how to manage those connections.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Bryan Unsell  
January 13, 2010, 9:53 pm  
10952 Griffin Dr  
Vance, Alabama 35490

GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Everything you are talking about has not happened and will not happen as long as the internet stays as much government free as possible. It will only become that way if the government gets involved and then creates monopolies. I say leave the internet alone in it's current form. It concerns me to see the government wanting to take over something that works totally fine in it's current capitalistic form. Freedom makes our country great, not regulation.

Still don't see the purpose behind this at all? What the video said made no sense what so ever. Keep the internet free please.



Brian Upton-Rowley  
January 13, 2010, 9:57 pm  
12124 194th Ave NE  
Redmond, Washington 98053

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Do not mess with the Internet. It is now the most free means of speech available to you and to me. Government regulation is not needed. It is highly competitive. It is also highly responsive to customers and their demands. I oppose government control.

With control or regulation by government, control over content will follow. That is unacceptable.

I became a citizen because of my love of the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution. Do not mess with this freedom. You may think you are enhancing the freedom or even expanding it. Your proposed actions will eventually reduce it.

It works now. "It aint broke". Don't break it in the name of fixing it.

You may not like the content of many sites for social, political, religious , or other reasons. That is fine. I do not either. But by using the vast powers of the government and regulators to tax, set policy, and restrict content is unacceptable. It is unacceptable for you as a regulator to try to take the freedom of it away. Drop the idea.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

This too is unacceptable.

LaVera & James Valle  
January 13, 2010, 10:04 pm  
7117 Pontiac Circle  
Chanhassen, Minnesota 55317

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Our constitution and bill of rights call for freedom and freedom of speech, religion, etc. You are taking all of that away with any rights whatsoever. God help us all.

Frank van Dalen  
January 13, 2010, 10:06 pm  
3021 ne 72nd dr. ste. 9-136  
Vancouver, Washington 98661

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Not to mention it is all UNCONSTITUTIONAL !!!

Brian Van De Beuken  
January 13, 2010, 10:25 pm  
768 W. Golden St.  
Gilbert, Arizona 85233

The Internet flourished as an open market and with little regulation. Now that it is a huge success, Washington is trying to determine how they can insert their heavy hand and gain fees from it's use. Keep your hands off the Internet. It's been more than fine without you mucking things up.

In addition:

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Julienne VanDerZiel  
January 13, 2010, 10:30 pm  
851 Polo Club Drive  
Austin, Texas 78737

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Willaim VanVliet  
January 13, 2010, 10:30 pm  
13615 South Dixie Hwy  
miami, Florida 33176

DO not screw up the internet. Don't fix what is not broken

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Charles Vark  
January 13, 2010, 10:31 pm  
2558 E Pueblo  
Mesa, Arizona 85204

Keep the government out of controlling the internet.

Sharon Varney-Thurman  
January 13, 2010, 10:35 pm  
2639 S. Dicks Creek Rd.  
LaFayette, Georgia 30728

As an Americans for Prosperity activist and an I.T. professional, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



edward vaughan  
January 13, 2010, 10:38 pm  
3274 tex blvd  
fort worth, Texas 76116 4231

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Looks to this writer that this is a matter of freedom of expression just the same as speaking freely about what's on our mind. Such action as being considered is clearly not constitutional in my opinion.

Patrick Vaughan  
January 13, 2010, 10:49 pm  
8341 East 13th Street  
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74112

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The internet is an open forum that is available to everyone world wide - a true freedom for all. Regulation or control of the internet by any governmental entity is neither necessary nor desired except that it may be necessary or desired by the government to control and suppress dissent. There can be no ethical or moral justification for controlling or suppressing dissent or free speech. Our founding fathers warned us against allowing our government such power. I stand with them. Leave the internet open.

Karen Vaughn  
January 13, 2010, 10:50 pm  
43991 John Warner Road  
Temecula, California 92592

Please pay attention to the comments of individuals like myself. The impact of your decision is crucial to maintaining a competitive environment which encourages achievement instead of accepting mediocrity.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thank you for your consideration of a differing view regarding this important issue.

Sincerely,  
Karen D. Vaughn

Robert Velon  
January 13, 2010, 10:58 pm  
6700 Butler Road  
Penryn, California 95663

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

There has already been too many government takeovers. Leave the Internet alone please!!!

WILLIAM VENRICK  
January 13, 2010, 11:16 pm  
434 Westview Drive  
Lancaster, Ohio 43130

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

**WE DO NOT NEED MORE GOVERNMENT CONTROLS!**

rocky venti  
January 13, 2010, 11:17 pm  
4127 cheryl drive  
redding, California 96002

Do you people want to kill the only thing left in this country that is still creating jobs? Manufacturing, production, etc. have all been destroyed and there is no indication any of these things are ever coming back. Most jobs have been moved off-shore and if you take the internet we will turn into a third world country. I realize that is what obama and his cohorts want but we, the American People, are not going to let that happen. If necessary you will see another revolution similar to 1775. Leave the internet alone!!!

Ron Verburg  
January 13, 2010, 11:25 pm  
8409 Moriane Av  
Munster, Indiana 46321

I am writing to ask that the federal government please keep its hands off the internet. It is a thriving example of American ingenuity. When the government gets out of the way, new ideas and businesses grow dramatically, as has been the case with the internet.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Vicki Vercher  
January 13, 2010, 11:47 pm  
102 So. Marshall  
Bunkie, Louisiana 71322

To my government: short and sweet: keep your mitts off!!



William Vick  
January 13, 2010, 11:56 pm  
80 Upland Avenue  
Metuchen, New Jersey 8840

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Increased involvement by elected or appointed government officials in the internet arena can only worsen this vital resource. Please leave it competitive and free, or, if it isn't broken, don't fix it!

Bill Vick

Kim Villegas  
January 14, 2010, 12:07 am  
1106 Hollybluf St  
Austin, Texas 78753

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please remeber - It is "We The People" Not, We The Government"

Dale and Marilyn Voss  
January 14, 2010, 4:24 am  
1404 Jousting Ct  
Annapolis, Maryland 21403

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. STOP GOV'T TAKEOVER!!

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Beatrice Voytko  
January 14, 2010, 4:52 am  
8927 - G SW 97th Lane Rd  
Ocala, Florida 34481

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

NO... TO GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF THE INTERNET !!!

David Waddoups  
January 14, 2010, 5:48 am  
4317 OPAL AVE TRLR #42  
Pocatello, Idaho 83204

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Gwen Wadell  
January 14, 2010, 6:47 am  
300 N. Van Hoorebeke Rd.  
Joplin, Missouri 64801

I respectfully submit the following regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I believe the internet should remain free and competitive. I see no reason for it to be regulated - especially by the government at taxpayers expense.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

Linda Wagner  
January 14, 2010, 7:13 am  
1765 Elmhurst Lane  
Concord, California 94521

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We are fed up with the government interfering in everything we do! We have had enough of this! Stop the takeover of the internet!

thomas wahl  
January 14, 2010, 7:14 am  
1254 Pondoray circle  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84117

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I uphold the 1st amendment in the Constitution which guarantees freedom of speech and expression: uncensored by big government. I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Gene Waldenmaier  
January 14, 2010, 7:19 am  
7011 River road  
Fredericksburg, Virginia 22407-2331

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Bla...Bla Just keep away from the internet. There is absolutely no need for Government intervention. Let free enterprise remain free.

There is not one service that the government provides contrary to our constitution that the free system could not improve upon.

Diane Waldrop  
January 14, 2010, 7:20 am  
519 Woodmere Crossing  
St. Charles, Missouri 63303

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Barbara Walker  
January 14, 2010, 7:24 am  
19990 S. Hwy. RA  
Fair Play, Missouri 65649

Every congressman and senator should be fire along with the president of our great country for the harm they are putting on the USA citizens. Obama may apologize for the USA, but this country has done more good for others than any other country. As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Gregory Wallace  
January 14, 2010, 7:33 am  
1100 Bellflower Rd NE  
Minerva, Ohio 44657

With regards to an open internet please consider the following comments made by me, a patriot: GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Government imposed regulations and taxes on telephone services has made it an expensive and often times a cumbersome, unreliable means of communication and information. But, that is certainly not a surprise. You cannot name one service that is run efficiently by government when compared to the same service run by a private entity. The sheeple of this country will soon learn that with the socialized healthcare being forced upon them by a government that is NOT responsive to the needs and desires of the citizens it is to be serving. Capitalism works and works far better than the socialistic and communistic forms of government that are being thrust upon us by our politicians and their moronic, electorate that produces nothing and only lives on the public dole. However, Capitalism only works when government does NOT interfere. This has been proven over the last 234 years in this country. From 1776 through 1912 capitalism had escalated the United States to the position of the country with the highest standard of living in the world, while having NO debt. How was this accomplished? Simple, the damn government kept it's thieving hands out of the workings of capitalism. Then in 1913 the federal government (aka thieves) instituted the Federal Reserve and income tax. These undermined capitalism two ways. 1) Diluted the sovereignty status of this once illustrious nation by forfeiting the control of it's currency, in large part, to other countries through the federal reserve. 2) Financing the advancement of socialism and communism through the income tax. Since 1913 taxation has gradually increased to it's current obscene amount, and it's still escalating. The taxation is financing organizations such as labor unions and ACORN, and to buy controlling interest in railroad, banking, and automotive industries. Hell, tax dollars are even given to U.S. companies that build manufacturing plants in foreign countries. This serves only to tear down private enterprise, and to enslave the people of this country.

The internet works very well in it's current state. People get information quickly, people and companies make money, and pleasure is obtained through the internet. MEMBERS OF GOVERNMENT (AKA THIEVES) KEEP YOUR DAMN HANDS OUT OF THE INTERNET.

Kenneth H Wallace  
January 14, 2010, 7:38 am  
1336 Robinhood Drive  
Elgin, Illinois 60120

As an freedom loving American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Skip and Jean Wallin  
January 14, 2010, 7:39 am  
804 Brownwood Circle  
Jonesboro, Arkansas 72404

We are submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet should not be crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should only be achieved by a majority vote of the people of the U. S. The Commission should not on its own set into motion arbitrary regulatory changes that will force the people that use the internet down another unpopular bureaucratic maze of control and regulation.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. This is nothing short of more restrictive bureaucratic government control and regulation in an area that should be left solely to the voice of the qualified voters of the U. S.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of illegal anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing any new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Joan Wallis  
January 14, 2010, 7:42 am  
109 W. Rosa Drive  
Green Valley, Arizona 85614

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Besides these reasons, putting restrictions on Internet communication violates the Free Speech guaranteed by the First Amendment!!

Brad Walls  
January 14, 2010, 7:43 am  
PO Box 472  
Kechi, Kansas 67067

As an American activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Art Walter  
January 14, 2010, 7:43 am  
4614 77th Ave NW  
Gig Harbor, Washington 98335

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

David Walter  
January 14, 2010, 7:45 am  
2632 Kelly Street  
Livermore, California 94551

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

NO government take over of the internet!!!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Richard Walter  
January 14, 2010, 7:49 am  
Green  
Elkton, Maryland 21921

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Every Oppressive Government on earth today has started by contolling the Internet. This Administration risks sparking another true American Revolution which sweeps most of Congress and the Executive Branch into historical ignominy .

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Jean Walters  
January 14, 2010, 8:02 am  
16 Noble Lane  
Rome, New York 13440

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

John Walters  
January 14, 2010, 8:13 am  
33 Oakbridge Ct #1  
Madison, Wisconsin 53717

The following argument can be made in generalized form against any command and control rules enacted by regulatory agencies/bureaucracies without discussion and position taking by our legislation and executive branches. The legislative branch should not cede its responsibility of crafting the laws and regulations that guide the lives of their constituents.

Specifically:

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Diane Walz  
January 14, 2010, 8:25 am  
1130 Tiverton  
Schaumburg, Illinois 60193

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

My husband and I do not want government controlling the internet OR our healthcare and we also do NOT want Cap & Trade. LESS government is what most Americans are looking for, not more. WHEN will you listen? ..or will it take being voted out? Americans (in a MAJORITY ROLE) are speaking. HEAR US FOR A CHANGE!!!!!!!!!!!!

Lawrence Wangler  
January 14, 2010, 8:27 am  
7687 E. Mary Sharon Drive  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85266-1834

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

C. K. Wanner  
January 14, 2010, 8:31 am  
2562 Primrose Ln.  
York, Pennsylvania 17404

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Finally, I must wholeheartedly agree with the assessment of Commissioner Baker that new rules are not necessary or useful at this time and that the government's legal authority to regulate the internet has not been established.



Sylvia Waqnn  
January 14, 2010, 8:34 am  
302 Toll Circle  
Bluffton, Indiana 46714

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Even though this is a form letter, I agree with the fact that Government STAY OUT of controlling the Internet!!!

Kathi Ward  
January 14, 2010, 8:41 am  
940 Merlin Drive  
San Diego, California 92114

I do not want the Govenment taking over the internet by misleading us into thinking it is for the good of all of us. It is NOT! It is an infringement upon our right to Freedom of Speech! This is a right given to us as documented in the US Constitution! Apparently you have not read the Constitution for some time - please do - and while you are at it - please find the authority in there to force Americans to buy healthcare plans. YOU WON'T FIND IT!!!  
PLEASE START DOING WHAT YOU TOOK AN OATH TO DO - UPHOLDING THE US CONSTITUTION - START THERE - THEN WE CAN DISCUSS OTHER ISSUES!

Rick Ward  
January 14, 2010, 8:42 am  
PO Box 257  
Manns Harbor, North Carolina 27953

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Barbara Wardwell  
January 14, 2010, 8:44 am  
335 West First Street  
Reno, Nevada 89503

The bill of rights guarantees freedom of speech. Government control of the internet severely hinders this freedom and would be unconstitutional. The government has far too much control over us already and is operating way outside of the bounds anticipated by the founding fathers of this great nation. Power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. If you want to regulate something, regulate the removal of the kiddie porn, terrorist plots, and other illegal activity. Until you get that right, leave the rest alone.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Marie Warhola  
January 14, 2010, 8:48 am  
157-51 23 Avenue  
Whitestone, New York 11357

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The government has no business regulating the internet and we would appreciate it if you would keep your hands off it. I for one am sick and tired of the federal government's agenda to stifle free speech at every turn be it on the radio, TV or on the internet. The Constitution may be a piece of trash to you but it is sacred to us and we're fed up with your dismantling it at every turn.

Our internet has worked very well without government intrusion for all these years; there is absolutely no reason to change the pattern now. Enough is enough . . . do not infringe on the freedom of the internet. We don't appreciate your trying to destroy our liberties and we're not going to sit idly by and watch any more disappear.

In short, HANDS OFF!

James Warner  
January 14, 2010, 8:57 am  
312 N. Myrtle  
Elmhurst, Illinois 60126

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Donna Washburn  
January 14, 2010, 9:05 am  
6527 Grovewood  
Houston, Texas 77008

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Government control is going beyond what our fore-fathers built this country on, what happened to America land of the free? How many more restrictions do we have to withstand because of government? Will the restrictions apply to those in government? Like the rest of their rules and restrictions, probably not. Can government STOP taxing the people?

Jeannit Waterwall  
January 14, 2010, 9:15 am  
3917 Apache Drive  
Mount Vernon, Washington 98273

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We the people of America are weary of the people in Congress attempting to replace our liberty with their tyranny. Most of us are willing to resist the takeover of our country by liberal socialists.



S. Watford  
January 14, 2010, 9:16 am  
1098 Simmonsridge Drive  
Collierville, Tennessee 38017

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Joel Watkins  
January 14, 2010, 9:25 am  
502 St Stephen Ln  
Saint Charles, Missouri 63301

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

\*\*\*\*\*

If in fact you pass this, I will stop using the internet and do everything in my power to get as many people as possible to do the same. I am 100% against this and so is everyone else I mention it to. I am as well as most Americans and people on this planet AGAINST GOVERNMENT CONTROL OVER ANYTHING. Living without the internet (which I use every day mind you) will not be hard to do if you pull this controlling stunt.

Steve Watson  
January 14, 2010, 9:38 am  
718 Saddlewood Drive  
Wauconda, Illinois 60084

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ed Watts  
January 14, 2010, 9:41 am  
473 Santa Rosa St.  
San Jacinto, California 92583

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Government has never fixed anything; everything that government touches is either crippled or killed.

Gwen Watts  
January 14, 2010, 9:55 am  
P.O.Box 31  
Turner, Maine 4282

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

No more government takeovers!! Read the CONSTITUTION.

Gwen Watts  
Maine

Howard Wayland  
January 14, 2010, 9:57 am  
11902 Susan Forest LN  
Houston, Texas 77089

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. There is no need for government intervention in either sites or fiber optics systems. Everything works very well without the government and needs no intervention.

Adding envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense. There is no need for the government to become involved or add added burdens to network management practices.

With this, the Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this avenue.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

gary weathers  
January 14, 2010, 10:16 am  
133 snyder st.  
new albany, Mississippi 38652

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become. No damn government interference whether it be financial or otherwise, leave us alone damn socialistic administration!

Graham Webster-Gardiner  
January 14, 2010, 10:23 am  
3675 Old Dixie Hwy  
Mims, Florida 32754

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Without freedom democracy is worthless, the internet assists freedom. With a heavily biased liberal media , the internet is a vital area for free expression.



Laurence Wegner  
January 14, 2010, 10:54 am  
9266 Crescent Beach Rd  
Sand Point, Michigan 48755

Leave our internet alone, this is one way we can exercise our FREEDOM OF SPEECH!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Darrell Wehlmann  
January 14, 2010, 11:05 am  
28842 Mahon  
Hockley, Texas 77447

As an Americans who cares, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James Weiaa  
January 14, 2010, 11:12 am  
13 Wright Farm Road  
Concord, Massachusetts 1742

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James Weiser  
January 14, 2010, 11:42 am  
3101 Cty 45 NW  
Hackensack, Minnesota 56452

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Susan Weldy  
January 14, 2010, 12:23 pm  
203 Boxwood Circle  
Brandon, Mississippi 39047

As an American that still believes in free speech, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

More "Change" I can do without.

Harry Wells  
January 14, 2010, 1:08 pm  
44 Salisbury Drive  
Westwood, Massachusetts 2090

"Open Internet" is a huge misnomer. It should be called Closed Internet. But if you insist, let's change the name to The Senator Nelson Internet -- that is how open it will be.

Annette Wernhoff  
January 14, 2010, 1:35 pm  
339 KUBE Rd  
Grangeville, Idaho 83522

Enough, the federal government needs to stay away from more control - including the internet. I do not see that written in the constitution?

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Patricia Wendling  
January 14, 2010, 1:50 pm  
2111 Salem Church Road  
Irmo, South Carolina 29063

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Basically- stay out of my life and quit trying to take control of everything...We the People do not need you and if we do, we will ask...but don't hold your breath waiting for that to happen!!!



Stephen Wendt  
January 14, 2010, 2:14 pm  
7385 Wyandot Lane  
Liberty Township, Ohio 45044

Dear Reader, Please consider the following. As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

B. E. & S. F. Wenke  
January 14, 2010, 2:17 pm  
5882 W Del Lago Circle  
Glendale, Arizona 95308

We are submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

We are opposed to the proposed rulemaking for the following reasons: The proposed burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

We are especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Charles Wenzel  
January 14, 2010, 2:29 pm  
624 Marana Drive  
Carmel, Indiana 46032

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

A transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mike Wenzel  
January 14, 2010, 2:34 pm  
3256 Sagewater Ct  
Fort Collins, Colorado 80528

There isn't anything about the Internet that the government needs to fix! Screw this up and you will cripple America's competitiveness and lessen its freedoms.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

SCOTT WERDEBAUGH  
January 14, 2010, 2:38 pm  
1050 SOUTH EVERGREEN DRIVE  
INDEPENDENCE, Oregon 97351-1619

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Moreover, restrictions on internet content is a violation of my Constitutional rights to FREE speech. For this reason any restrictions, including such restrictions now being contemplated, are therefore unconstitutional, whoever places such restrictions on the public's right to free speech.

Nancy Weres  
January 14, 2010, 2:42 pm  
9745 Old Placerville RD apt. 1  
Sacramento, California 95827

Re: GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am against the proposed "Open Internet" changes because they violate the First Amendment of the Constitution. I appreciate your hard work, but recognize that you were appointed, not elected, and have no authority to radically change the Internet. If the Founders had wanted appointed Commissions and Departments to make significant decisions about American life, they would have put that in the Constitution. The Constitution also states that powers not given to the Federal government belong to the states or to the citizens, except to aid the "general welfare." The proposal does not help all Americans generally, but helps some and hurts others.

Thank you.

Cheri Werner  
January 14, 2010, 2:52 pm  
354 Runner Road  
Bowling Green, Kentucky 42101

Enough government intervention in our lives already. FCC: scratch the 'Open Internet' idea.

Mark Weshinsky  
January 14, 2010, 3:08 pm  
11194 Edwards Farm Lane  
Purcellville, Virginia 20132

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Elmer G. West  
January 14, 2010, 3:20 pm  
514 Saipan Place  
San Antonio, Texas 78221-2935

As an American for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,

Elmer G. West

Frances West  
January 14, 2010, 3:49 pm  
620 ACR 308  
Frankston, Texas 75763

I enjoy my freedoms. I just can't see anyone taking them away from me.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Frances West  
January 14, 2010, 3:52 pm  
620 ACR 308  
Frankston, Texas 75763

I enjoy my freedoms. I just can't see anyone taking them away from me.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sandy West  
January 14, 2010, 5:08 pm  
143 Lakeview  
Fritch, Texas 79036

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Thomas West  
January 14, 2010, 5:24 pm  
9611 W 56th Terr  
Merriam, Kansas 66203

We are NOT China.

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

William Westerman  
January 14, 2010, 5:28 pm  
11404 Caravel Circle  
FT. Myers, Florida 33908

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Steve Westfall  
January 14, 2010, 5:36 pm  
P.O. Box 6995  
Ocean Isle Beach, North Carolina 28469

As an interested American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the Internet as it stands today. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The "burden of proof" standard for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

Leave The Internet alone. We don't need anyone in Washington telling us how The Internet should operate. There should never be any government money involved in the internet. The "public utility" model is unnecessary intrusion into something that is not broken. The U.S. government should leave it alone. There are too many other things that could use the focus.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please, leave The Internet alone!

Regards,

jERRY WESTON  
January 14, 2010, 5:39 pm  
po bOX 294  
nORTH hIGHLANDS, California 95660-0294

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

GET THE HELL OUT OF OUR LIVES AND RESTORE OUR GOVERNMENT TO US. WE ARE TIRED OF THESE RIDICULOUS LIBERAL EFFORTS TO TAKE OVER OUR GOVERNMENT. IF YOU DO NOT BACK OFF, YOU ARE GUARANTEED TO FEEL THE WRATH OF THE AMERICAN CITIZENS. WHY DO YOU WANT GOVERNMENT TO BE INVOLVED IN EVERY ASPECT OF OUR LIVES? WE NEED LESS GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE, NOT MORE.

IF YOU CONTROL THE INTERNET WE, THE CITIZENRY WILL TAKE OVER THE CONGRESS BY REPLACING EVERY LIBERAL. BELIEVE ME!!!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Lawrence Whalley  
January 14, 2010, 6:12 pm  
50 Bright Oaks Circle  
Cary, Illinois 60013-1551

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

With the clear and present danger of government preventing release of information adverse to its own interests the FCC has no business even suggesting any control of the internet. All one has to do is look at the fraud that is the climategate which is a case study in government cover-up of adverse information to its interest in control.

More government means less freedom. Keep your hands off the internet.

kim whatcott  
January 14, 2010, 6:14 pm  
1318 east harold drive  
san tan valley, Arizona 85140

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52: Keep your mitts off the internet.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Norman Wheatly  
January 14, 2010, 6:32 pm  
2906 Holly Hall  
Houston, Texas 77054

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Ben Wheeler  
January 14, 2010, 6:32 pm  
17927 Plantsville Rd  
Amesville, Ohio 45711

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Name one thing the government runs that turns a profit?

USPS...NO

AMTRAK...NO

The Chicken Ranch Brothel....NOPE

Medicare/Medicade/Social Security....NO.

What makes you think we want the FCC to control the internet, you can handle TV or Radio.

Sidney Wheeler  
January 14, 2010, 7:00 pm  
906 live Oak Lane  
Fleming Island, Florida 32003

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

John P Wheelus Jr  
January 13, 2010, 12:32 pm  
1708 E Annona Ave  
Tampa, Florida 33612

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.  
No Government intervention.

Carol White  
January 13, 2010, 12:39 pm  
15050 N 8th Way  
Phoenix, Arizona 85022

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I was born when there was no internet. I am thrilled to live in a country that allows freedom to invent and develop. I do not want the internet or other phone and cable communication systems controlled by the government. It needs to remain part of the free market so richly and uniquely American.

Douglas White  
January 13, 2010, 12:40 pm  
2804 Crestwood Rd.  
Smyrna, Georgia 30080

Keep your commie leaning, panty wearing hands off my computer and my internet connection or your gonna pay hell for it.

Sincerely,  
Douglas W. White



James White  
January 13, 2010, 12:41 pm  
3912 Cresthill Road  
Chester, Virginia 23831

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

I am a retired AF Colonel. I believe in the Constitution. I believe in free speech. I do not want any further restrictions on free speech nor do I want you to regulate the internet, which would defacto place restrictions on free speech. I do not want any internet taxes. I do not want anyone regulating any part of my life, and that includes internet usage. Please understand the message I (and many others) am telling you. We want you to leave the internet alone!!!! Now, read the following additional comments and pay close attention to the meaning.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

JD White  
January 13, 2010, 12:44 pm  
7555 Princeton Glendale Rd  
Hamilton, Ohio 45011

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Judith E White  
January 13, 2010, 12:47 pm  
201 Union Ave. S. E. #59  
Renton, Washington 98059

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Richard White  
January 13, 2010, 12:49 pm  
15050 N 8th Way  
Phoenix, Arizona 85022

I oppose the proposed intrusive regulation of the internet contained in the docket, "In the Matter of Preserving the Open Internet". My family has used several different internet service providers in the past fifteen years, and we are pleased with the improvements in service and the broad selection of providers which have developed in that time. We do not see evidence that ISP's are abusing the public in any manner which would justify FCC intervention.

Please devote your time and attention to matters more worthy of them.

Yours truly,  
Richard White  
Phoenix, AZ

Thomas White  
January 13, 2010, 12:50 pm  
1300 W. Broward Blvd  
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33312

Stop this attempted government takeover of the internet!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

William White  
January 13, 2010, 12:54 pm  
97 Sunset Road  
Carlisle, Massachusetts 1741

Government regulation is not appropriate.

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Margaret and Ken Whitehead  
January 13, 2010, 12:56 pm  
809 Ridge Place  
Falls Church, Virginia 22046

We oppose: GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

We are especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Terree Whitehead  
January 13, 2010, 12:58 pm  
3005 Hidden Lakae Dr.  
Duluth, Georgia 30096

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

We are very weary of the continued money grabbing from all. There will soon be nothing to grab from anyone. Consider what this is doing to your bottom line. Your Customers so to speak.



Terree Whitehead  
January 13, 2010, 12:58 pm  
3005 Hidden Lake Dr.  
Duluth, Georgia 30096

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Consider what this would do to all business and just general communications within families. Is this what we pay for? Americans are asking this question with issue of today. Please rethink this attempt, the internet should stay neutral, period.

Barb Whitham  
January 13, 2010, 1:02 pm  
1109 Oak Forest Dr  
FT Worth, Texas 76114

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn to assure free speech and open discussions.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent utilization of business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose personal uncertainty and create huge litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government censorship/ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government and approved by a majority of the American voters. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path to censorship and further reductions of our constitutional rights.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted and scrutinized. In the absence of verifiable, concrete evidence of any discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

George Whitley  
January 13, 2010, 1:02 pm  
637 Jordan Ridge Lane  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27603

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The Internet has become the greatest tool of freedom in the last 100 years. It should be allowed to grow and spread freedom and enlightenment worldwide.

Hal C. Whitley  
January 13, 2010, 1:02 pm  
1126 N Fletcher  
Fernandina Bch, Florida 32034

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52: The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense. The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney. Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Dwight Whitlock  
January 13, 2010, 1:03 pm  
117 Brereton Drive  
Raleigh, North Carolina 27615

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is a highly competitive open medium. As such it has greatly impacted the monopoly of newspapers and traditional TV news to control the information flow to US citizens by opening free speech to a level not available since our founding fathers brandished their "illegal" presses during the times preceding the American Revolution. Now we are entering into a time where the open internet is allowing competition with the traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies. This is American capitalism at the purest. The combination of these elements are behind the drive to "control the internet as it is the one media that no one has control of.

"Net Neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. There is no concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations other than the .

Robert Whitton  
January 13, 2010, 1:04 pm  
174 Shepherds Way  
Morganton, Georgia 30560

As an Americans for Prosperity member, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Billy Whitworth  
January 13, 2010, 1:05 pm  
2250 Donelson Drive  
Hickory Withe, Tennessee 38028

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

This is America! Let's keep it that way.

Jon Wicke  
January 13, 2010, 1:05 pm  
1170 Black Hawk Rd  
Eaton, Colorado 80615

As an American citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Jerry Wickman  
January 13, 2010, 1:06 pm  
13015 NE Broadway  
Portland, Oregon 97230

In the language of English, open internet is what we now have.  
Open internet in the language of the buraucrat is meant to obsfuscate and decieve in order to remove more freedoms from citizens.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Diane Wickstrom  
January 13, 2010, 1:07 pm  
4632 Ridgeview Cy.  
Wis. Rapids, Wisconsin 54494

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Please keep the free market success of the internet intact. Don't allow the government interfere and move ahead with "Open Internet".

Thomas Wictor  
January 13, 2010, 1:12 pm  
15843 E. San Jose Avenue  
La Puente, California 91744

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

John Wiebe  
January 13, 2010, 1:13 pm  
1390 Alison Court  
Westminster, Maryland 21158

I hereby submit the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

What made the internet the force it is today was the determination and dedication of the "little guy" - people all over the world dedicated to making it happen. And it happened with little or no governmental interference. Let's keep government out of the internet as much as we possibly can. In so doing, we will preserve what the "little guy" has so ingeniously created.

Rachael Wierenga  
January 13, 2010, 1:16 pm  
7338 Oakhaven Ct. NE  
Ada, Michigan 49301

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,

Rachael Wierenga

James Wigal  
January 13, 2010, 1:21 pm  
218 Thompson Run Road  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15237

As an American Taxpayer, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Mike Wiley  
January 13, 2010, 1:22 pm  
11016 Linden Leaf Ave.  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89144

As an American and a free one at that, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is protected speech under the first amendment. No government action should be taken against it.

To do so is a violation of your oath of office and punishable by incarceration.

You will be held accountable for your actions.

Mike Wiley  
Republican Candidate for US Senate

Brian Wilfong  
January 13, 2010, 1:25 pm  
48 N. Williams St.  
Newark, Ohio 43055

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Kristine Wilkins  
January 13, 2010, 1:31 pm  
1031 Webster Drive  
Sandy, Utah 84093

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Freedom of Speech. This is my right as an American Citizen. I have lived abroad in Finland and Russia and seen what "censoring" by the government can do. I will use every means at my disposal to fight the government take over of the internet.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Patrice Wilkins  
January 13, 2010, 1:33 pm  
PO Box 2013  
Everett, Washington 98213

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Plus stoping the Government from trying to take control of the United States..

scott wilkinson  
January 13, 2010, 1:33 pm  
690 kimberly  
Birmingham, Michigan 48009

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Carroll Williams  
January 13, 2010, 1:36 pm  
5077 Saw Grass Drive  
Northampton, Pennsylvania 18067

I am an every-day user of the Internet. I use to communicate with relatives, friends, fellow retirees and business associates. I DON'T want government sticking their nose in the public domain. The Internet has operated well enough without Big Brother (FCC) breathing down our throats. We don't need any more big government.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Retha Williams  
January 13, 2010, 1:37 pm  
2122 71st Street  
Lubbock, Texas 79412

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

To me this is just another invasion of our privacy and our rights to free speech. The only reason they are wanting to do this is so we as Americans can't communicate to each other and keep things moving in America. I'm highly opposed to Government intervening with the internet.

Charles B Williams Jr  
January 13, 2010, 1:38 pm  
24675 Gold Star Drive  
Moreno Valley, California 92551

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

**GET YOUR GOVERNMENT HANDS OFF THE INTERNET!!**

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Cheryl Willis  
January 13, 2010, 1:43 pm  
1115 Ave. C, trailer 5  
Kearney, Nebraska 68847

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions and may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Gene Willis  
January 13, 2010, 1:45 pm  
917 Bluff Drive  
Lebanon, Tennessee 37087

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

There is NOTHING "OPEN" about the "Open Internet" proposal! It is just ONE MORE attempt of the current administration's SOCIALIST AGENDA to destroy MY COUNTRY. If you buy into this absurd plot, you will be fueling the fire that will soon destroy the last vestiges of The Constitution of the United States of America.

NO "commission" has the LEGAL power to change anything! We have an ELECTED Congress to do that.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

---

It is not our duty to leave wealth to our children,  
but it is our duty to leave liberty to them. We have  
counted the cost of this contest, and we find  
nothing so dreadful as voluntary slavery."

John Dickinson  
Signer of the U.S. Constitution  
From Delaware

---



Jon Wilson  
January 13, 2010, 1:47 pm  
933 Mancos Way  
Fruita, Colorado 81521

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,  
Jon Wilson

linda wilson  
January 13, 2010, 1:48 pm  
3813 scarborough dr  
new haven, Indiana 46774

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Marian Wilson  
January 13, 2010, 1:50 pm  
455 Longridge Drive  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15243

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Marian Wilson

Mark Wilson  
January 13, 2010, 1:59 pm  
1254 Cobble Pond Way  
Vienna, Virginia 22182

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The Government should not be in the communications business, period.

Melinda Wiman  
January 13, 2010, 2:02 pm  
1997 Vista Del Valle Blvd  
El Cajon, California 92019

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

If government exercises control over the Internet, there will be no place to turn.

The transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

There is no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

STEVEN WINDROSS  
January 13, 2010, 2:04 pm  
236 Hickory Dr  
Lena, Illinois 61048

As an American Citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn, and it opens the door for Government violations of personal privacy.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Linda Winks  
January 13, 2010, 2:04 pm  
5765 Cairo Rd  
Westerville, Ohio 43081-4006

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

sue winn  
January 13, 2010, 2:05 pm  
5528 S. Independence  
Okla. City, Oklahoma 73119

As an Americans, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

\*\*\* PLEASE DO NOT PASS ANY MORE GOV'T REGULATIONS ON THE CITIZENS OF USA. THIS ACTION IS AGAINST FREE SPEECH.

AMERICA WOULD BE BETTER OFF IF ALL OF D.C. WOULD CLOSE DOWN FOR A YEAR. SPENDING "OTHER PEOPLE'S MONEY" AGAINST THEM IS CRIMINAL. GOV'T HAS ZERO BUSINESS IN THIS AREA. THERE IS NO MORE MONEY & THIS ACTION WOULD ONLY RESULT IN MORE LAYOFFS & RAISE COST BESIDE GIVING TOO MUCH CONTROL TO GOVERNMENT. WE CITIZENS ARE TOTALLY AGAINST ANY ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS. PLEASE DO SOMETHING USEFUL, LIKE SAVE THE FREEDOMS OF AMERICA. QUIT FIDDLING WITH FREE COMMERCE.

IT SEEMS LIKE THE CITIZENS IN THIS COUNTRY FEAR GOVERNMENT MORE THAN EVER. PLEASE LEAVE SOMETHING THAT WORKS ALONE.

---

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Lucye K. Winn-Stanton  
January 13, 2010, 2:10 pm  
Ashley Rd  
Milton, Florida 32583

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

**PLEASE STOP THIS FOLLY! WE ARE LOSING EVERY RIGHT AND FREEDOM OF WHICH THIS COUNTRY IS POSSESSED!**

**STOP THE DESPOILERS BEFORE ALL OUR LIBERTIES HAVE BEEN DESECRATED AND DESTROYED!**

Holly Winsman  
January 13, 2010, 2:11 pm  
13500 Turtle Marsh Loop #816  
Orlando, Florida 32837

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The American people WILL NOT live in a socialist country where the government controls everything including internet. NO NET NEUTRALITY. Cease and desist immediately!

Holly Winsman  
January 13, 2010, 2:25 pm  
13500 Turtle Marsh Loop #816  
Orlando, Florida 32837

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

The government needs to keep their hands off the internet. WE DO NOT NEED GOVERNMENT RUN ANYTHING!!!!  
KEEP YOUR HANDS OFF!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

Jared Wise  
January 13, 2010, 2:30 pm  
224 Nellis  
Goldsboro, North Carolina 27534

If the government took control of the internet that would be just one more step towards a socialist society. It seems to me that the democrats are slowly trying to control every aspect of our lives. If the "open Internet" proposal goes through, the next government take over will be TV and/or radio. The internet is currently the only medium that someone such as myself with no media connections to vent my political strife. If the government takes over what would stop them from silencing my my and other's words?

Long Live the First Ammendment!!!

Rick Wittock  
January 13, 2010, 2:40 pm  
2012 Kimmy Lane  
Arnold, Missouri 63010

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

James Wolford Jr.  
January 13, 2010, 2:41 pm  
N13677 Old 38 Rd  
Wausaukee, Wisconsin 54177

As an Americans for Prosperity friend, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I would personally like to add that like anything else in society, there lies the potential for good and evil uses of this mode of communication. As a citizen, I am advocating for the freedom to choose which of that particular content I wish to view or transmit and do not wish to have this freedom replaced with the federal governments idea of what I should be allowed to view or transmit. I have a moral standard of what should be allowed for me based not on my opinion, but on the moral standard found in the Bible. If the government was to make that decision for me, who decides the standard allowed, and what would they base that opinion on?

A poll? Because today's governmental moral standard would not be fixed and unchangeable, like the Bible's, the potential for abuse would be far too great to risk.

Larry Wood  
January 13, 2010, 2:45 pm  
2227 Country Villa CT.  
Auburn, California 95603

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I respectfully urge to leave the internet alone and free.

Steven Woodcock  
January 13, 2010, 2:48 pm  
4565 Allison Drive  
Colorado Springs, Colorado 80916

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52. Put simply, the Internet MUST be open and free, unregulated except by its users.

The Internet is already highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Jim Woodford  
January 13, 2010, 2:51 pm  
1624 Davidson St  
Jacksonville, Florida 32207

As an American, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Andy Woods  
January 13, 2010, 2:55 pm  
1602 Cheatham Dam Rd  
Ashland City, Tennessee 37015-6152

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Sincerely,

Andy Woods

Patricia Woods  
January 13, 2010, 3:08 pm  
2707 7th Avenue  
Pueblo, Colorado 81003

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Steve Woodside  
January 13, 2010, 3:09 pm  
118 KE JO Point Road  
Gravois Mills, Missouri 65037

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Alice Woolard  
January 13, 2010, 3:31 pm  
812 Young St.  
Nokomis, Illinois 62075

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Government I taking away the freedom of the people,rewriting laws that have been in force since the beginning of America,these lawmakers should pack their bags and go where government not freedom is A way of life. Nov and election time is coming so we can clean house!!!!

Susannah Worth  
January 13, 2010, 3:40 pm  
4925 Collins Avenue  
Miami Beach, Florida 33140

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

FREE SPEECH means one is FREE TO SPEAK

FREE MARKET PLACE includes the MARKET PLACE OF IDEAS

As an American I want this FREEDOM - Anyone who votes for this in Congress will not get my vote again. NOR will I EVER VOTE FOR THEIR PARTY AGAIN.

Sandy Wray  
January 13, 2010, 3:45 pm  
21705 Ridge Circle  
Elkhorn, Nebraska 68022-2222

THERE IS TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT IN OUR LIVES AS IT IS. GOVERNMENT IS TO PROTECT US...NOT HAVE THEIR NOSE AND HAND IN EVERY ASPECT OF OUR LIVES.

CONCENTRATE ON CUTTING WASTEFUL SPENDING AND WEED OUT THE CORRUPTION THAT IS PROLIFIC IN WASHINGTON, D.C. AMONG ALL MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS AND THE CURRENT ADMINISTRATION!!!

ABIDE BY THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE BILL OF RIGHTS. IF THOSE DOCUMENTS WERE ADHERED TO OUR ECONOMY, STANDING IN THE WORLD, AND THE CORRUPTION IN ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT WOULD NOT EXIST.

GOD BLESS AMERICA....WE NEED ALL THE HELP WE CAN GET TO CORRECT THE SITUATION OUR COUNTRY HAS SUCCUMBED TO.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.





Brian Wright  
January 13, 2010, 3:47 pm  
39529 Village Wood Road  
Novi, Michigan 48375

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

I do not want the government to control the Internet; it does not respond to market demands, i.e. my demands as a customer. Companies, even privileged corporations, do respond to my demands as a customer. Keep your caveman hands off my Internet.

Robert Wright  
January 13, 2010, 3:57 pm  
161D Pelham Lane  
Monroe Twp., New Jersey 8831

I am demanding that you the government keep your grubby hands and nose out of our lives and the internet As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

steve wright  
January 13, 2010, 4:07 pm  
915 n hawthorne ln  
915 n hawthorne ln  
indpls, Indiana 46219

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

Stay out our lives. The web does not belong to the government!!!!

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Kurt Wuelper  
January 13, 2010, 4:12 pm  
1336 Parker Mountain Road  
Strafford, New Hampshire 3884

As a public minded citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. On the other hand, I would appreciate a provider that censors lots of stuff to protect me from predators of various stripes.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically or socially efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so long that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down or even stifling the lightly regulated, competitive Internet.

Nancy Wujcik  
January 13, 2010, 4:29 pm  
1437 County Road 411  
Poplar Bluff, Missouri 63901

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

I am strongly opposed to the plan for government take over of the internet. Instead, I am supporting the free, unfettered, private sector management of the internet.

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Do not take away another freedom by imposing more government regulation and control in yet another area of our life-the internet. This plan is not for an open internet but a government controlled internet.

Shasta Yankee  
January 13, 2010, 4:46 pm  
190 Burnley Road  
Hartsville, Tennessee 37074

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Net Neutrality is a farce and the American people will be able to see right through it.

Annie Yarbrough  
January 13, 2010, 5:17 pm  
12324 Ridgefield Parkway Henrico, VA  
Henrico, Virginia 23233

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

As provided by the US Constitution, I have freedom of speech. As provided by God, I have life, liberty and real hope for a future. Communist interference is not what Americans want or will accept. Don't you dare try to limit the freedoms provided to me and every other citizen of the USA who chooses to read and believe!

You do recall the blizzard during the Global Warming Conference in Copenhagen, don't you?

Pamela Yaste  
January 13, 2010, 5:24 pm  
1457 Nine Mile Crossroad W.  
Pikeville, Tennessee 37367

As an American citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Stephen Yates  
January 13, 2010, 6:24 pm  
2506 Glynnwood Drive  
Bartlesville, Oklahoma 74006

As an Americans, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Craig and Susan Yocom  
January 13, 2010, 7:20 pm  
26504 Bennett Blvd.  
Monroe, Oregon 97456

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please keep the government out of the Internet!!!

Jean York  
January 13, 2010, 8:06 pm  
7269 Sandhill Road  
Akron, New York 14001

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52: The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn. The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense. The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney. Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path. I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized. Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Larry York  
January 13, 2010, 8:37 pm  
2200 College Parkway  
Flower Mound, Texas 75028

As an concerned citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Connie Young  
January 13, 2010, 9:32 pm  
PO Box 414  
Mocksville, North Carolina 27028

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.



Norma Young  
January 13, 2010, 9:35 pm  
9821 Kendale Road  
Potomac, Maryland 20854

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

**NO GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF THE INTERNET! YOU ARE POWER HUNGRY! REMEMBER, YOU WORK FOR THE PEOPLE-LISTEN TO US!**

Russell Young  
January 13, 2010, 9:45 pm  
3418 Norwood Ave  
Pennsauken, New Jersey 8109

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Please leave it alone. Unintentioned censorship will be the the result of this regulation.



Philip Yount  
January 13, 2010, 9:45 pm  
11222 SW Cottonwood Lane  
Tigard, Oregon 97223

Hands off the Internet!

Barb Zakszewski  
January 13, 2010, 9:59 pm  
3674 Rochelle Lane  
Apopka, Florida 32712

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

It seems like everyday, this administration moves one step closer to Utopian Communism..We must stop the insanity now!!

Mark Zaugg  
January 13, 2010, 10:12 pm  
37 W. 1400 S.  
Bountiful, Utah 84010

As an concerned American citizen, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Furthermore, over regulation of the Internet could be considered as restriction of the rights of free speech. The Government need to stay out of free enterprise associated with the Internet.

Christian Zauner  
January 13, 2010, 10:32 pm  
14868 Ne. E. Thompson Court  
Portland, Oregon 97230

The last thing we need is some czar who, like most other czars, knows nothing about her/his area of responsibility. Do not model our internet after China's.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Gini Zelenak  
January 14, 2010, 6:11 am  
647 Orange Grove Ave #201  
South Pasadena, California 91030

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Cassie Zemke  
January 14, 2010, 6:37 am  
5519 Honor Drive  
Houston, Texas 77041

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

zhgfrsdlkrb zhgfrsdlkrb  
January 14, 2010, 7:45 am  
ysyErgugGI  
SzOycSqoqXWn  
New York, Utah 7668

cjSOcq <a href="http://mrikokxjotnv.com/">mrikokxjotnv</a>, [url=http://jytxtdwasbo.com/]jytxtdwasbo[/url],  
[link=http://cngzlhuriolu.com/]cngzlhuriolu[/link], http://zugzygaoevob.com/

Mark Ziebart  
January 14, 2010, 9:26 am  
6175 Habitat Dr. #3076  
Boulder, Colorado 80301-3225

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a frightening prospect. The Commission should not be allowed to set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

**KEEP GOVERNMENT'S HANDS OFF THE INTERNET!**



Jeffrey Zoffke  
January 14, 2010, 10:02 am  
1101 Church Rd.  
Angola, New York 14006

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

Keep the internet as a free form of communication. The government and its many agencies have intruded into too many parts of our lives already. The stupidity must stop. Stop stepping on our freedoms or eventually pay for your actions.

Fred Zolg  
January 14, 2010, 10:59 am  
3712 Belfast Ave  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45236

KEEP GOVERNMENT HANDS OFF THE INTERNET!!! I, as an individual American, AM VERY PLEASED with the current PRIVATELY BUILT AND MAINTAINED Internet! The Proposed Government regulations would DESTROY THE INTERNET.

KEEP YOUR HANDS OFF!!!

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional "phone" and traditional "cable" companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be "rescued" with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this "public utility" model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called "net neutrality" have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called "Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators") that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

duane zugel  
January 14, 2010, 1:35 pm  
3552 promontory street  
san diego, California 92109

Keep in mind that I own the internet too.

As an Americans for Prosperity activist, I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No. 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers. If government exercised control over the Internet, there would be no place to turn.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.

David Zupi  
January 14, 2010, 2:49 pm  
707 15th Ave E  
West Fargo, North Dakota 58078

I am submitting the following comment regarding the matter of preserving the open Internet. GN Docket No, 09-191, WC Docket No. 07-52:

The Internet is highly competitive. Traditional “phone” and traditional “cable” companies have been locked in an intense struggle to win customers, and wireless is rapidly becoming another viable alternative to wired broadband connections. If a private company blocked or censored Internet traffic maliciously it would lose its customers.

The envisioned burden of proof for requiring network management practices is unreasonably restrictive and will prevent business models that may be economically efficient. This will impose uncertainty and create litigation risks. Such restrictions would lower the rate of return on investments in building network capacity to the point that some of those investments would no longer make economic sense.

The Internet would then either remain crippled or be “rescued” with taxpayer subsidies, which would inevitably bring government control and politicization along with government ownership. Indeed, this “public utility” model is the desired outcome of many proponents of regulation, including former White House adviser Susan Crawford and Free Press founder Robert McChesney.

Such a transformation of the Internet into a government-controlled public utility is a major policy change that should be debated in Congress, the legitimately elected legislative branch of government. The Commission should not on its own set into motion regulatory changes that will force us down this path.

I am especially concerned that the Commission is already contemplating Internet content restrictions, such as the suggestion under paragraph 77 of the NPRM that the Commission may ultimately be the arbiter of which competing interests should be prioritized.

Advocates of so-called “net neutrality” have been ringing alarm bells now for so many years (starting with the November 19, 2002 letter to the Commission from the so-called “Coalition of Broadband Users and Innovators”) that their claims should be heavily discounted. In the absence of concrete evidence of discriminatory or anti-competitive behavior, there is simply no rationale for imposing new regulations that could have the effect of slowing down the great engine of innovation, growth, and expression that the lightly regulated, competitive Internet has become.